Title: Discussion on the Demand for Grant No. 20 under the control of the Department of Disinvestment for the year 2001-2002 (Concluded).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House will now take up item no. 16.

Motion moved:

> **"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper, be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in the course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 2002, in respect of heads of Demands entered in the Second column thereof against Demand No. 20 relating to the Department of Disinvestment."**

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, I rise to take part in the discussion on Demand for Grant under the control of the Department of Disinvestment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, possibly, it is the first time that, after the creation of this new Department called Department of Disinvestment, its grants are being discussed today. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Those who want to go out may go out quietly.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, first of all, I would like to say with all humility that our distinguished Minister, Shri Arun Shourie, who has been a champion for democracy, civil rights, rights of the people, with his conviction as a journalistâ€¦....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is going on? What is this discussion taking place?

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Sir, he has very convincingly disinvested his own wisdom, his own conviction in the Treasury Bench as the Minister of Department of Disinvestment, surrendering all the ideals, of course, excepting his philosophy, which was similar to the philosophy of Swatantra Party and other parties, which has rightly been reflected in the document printed by the Government of India and not approved by the Cabinet and which has not been decisively stated as a policy of the Government. Sir, today, the Standing Committee Report was laid on the Table of the House. ...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What discussion is going on in the last row? Hon. Members, if you are not interested, you can go to the Lobby. Do not disturb the House like this.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Sir, today the Standing Committee Report relating to the grants of the Department of Disinvestment has been tabled and in that Report of the Committee − which is a Committee of the House - cutting across party lines, there is a conclusive observation, opinion and decision, after taking evidence, that there is no comprehensive policy as such of the Government in so far as disinvestment is concerned.

The Ministry, in spite of that, has chosen to circulate a document to Members of Parliament titled `Disinvestment Policy and Procedures'. What does it say? It says in the background which are the parts of the world which went for privatisation, gives background of how the western economy successfully yielded results in the market forces. It highlighted the background, which are the areas and in what percentage and in what manner the Government since 1991 tried to touch the PSUs. It is a chronological data. It is a brochure of various incidents, a document of various outcomes. Is it a policy?

My first question is that the Department is discussing its grants without a policy, which has been substantiated by the Standing Committee. The cover page of the very document which has been circulated says `Disinvestment Policy and Procedure' and inside says `some chronological incidents from 1990 to 1999 of various Governments'.

Is it a policy? What is your policy? You have not spelt out what your policy is. In some cases, you say that the resources from disinvestment have to be utilised in social sector, for restructuring PSUs, for technological upgradation; in some cases, we find that it is nothing, and he is only trying to stretch his hand to meet the budgetary deficit gap. If it is to be utilised in social sector, can the Minister say today, during the reply on the Demands for Grants of the Department of Disinvestment, as to what percentage of the net realisation has been allocated for social sector and for restructuring PSUs till date. I know that the amount is very less.

In the beginning, as I said, this Government is not having any comprehensive disinvestment policy. We are Members of Parliament, and we are not the school children. You have simply circulated a document of chronological events under the title of "Disinvestment Policy and Procedures". I would not like to use any harsh words, but I think that you should not take the Members of Parliament and the House so lightly, while circulating a document in the name of policy, that too not approved or gone through by the Cabinet. This Government is running this Department without a policy, with a casual, ad hoc approach, manipulation, favouritism, nepotism, and if I may say so, encouraging and indulging in corruption which had been highly exposed in the case of BALCO.

On the day of BALCO debate, you may recall Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I did ask whether Sterlite is a strategic partner or strategic owner, and whether it is privatisation or disinvestment. The Minister has clarified in this document in his own introductory remarks that disinvestment means privatisation. Is it the policy of the Government that disinvestment means privatisation? No. The Government is in double mind till now. If you say that a particular public sector has to bring down its share to the tune of 26 per cent and the balance to be kept in the hands of the PFI, how is it total privatisation? However, the Minister in his introductory remarks said that disinvestment means total privatisation. I am sorry to say that you have not copied anything from the developing nations; you could not copy anything from India; you copied from what the Western economists had to say. This whole document, when I read it carefully, appears as if it has been printed, edited, typed, planned, thought out in the United States of America and not here. If that is the way you think that our country is changing to that tune very fast, I am sorry to say, Mr. Minister, it could be your personal ideological philosophy to be attributed to a newspaper article when you will not be a Minister, but that is not the philosophy of this Parliament, including that of the NDA constituents and the country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in regard to BALCO, I repeatedly referred to the Solicitor General, Additional Solicitor General and other legal experts opinion, that is, whether Sterlite can be chosen as a partner, which is under a cloud. You refused to answer it on that day. Today, SEBI has barred M/s. Sterlite Industries from accessing the capital market. SEBI has also initiated prosecution proceedings against the Directors of Sterlite Industries and its officials. Is it not a shame on the part of the Government that having known all these facts, of the scandalous arrangements of Sterlite, it deliberately misled the Parliament that everything was clear and everything was nice? Everything was non-transparent, and you have encouraged this deal by putting the nation's interest at stake, by putting BALCO in the hands of such manipulators who destroyed India's economy in the share market yesterday and who have been charge-sheeted by SEBI.

What is your answer? Mr. Minister, if I would have been in your position, with all humility at my command, I would have resigned. I would have put in my papers to the hon. Prime Minister, saying, `Mr. Prime Minister, I could not help you and guide you in the right direction. My Department has entered into a strategic partnership with an organisation that has ultimately been questioned by another organ of the Finance Minister, the SEBI'. Do you call it a transparent deal? Do you call it proper disinvestment? If people shout outside against this calling it a scam, you feel it is a conspiracy by the Opposition.

Sir, I, therefore, would like to tell you that this Government is not having a policy. They are deliberately and desperately looting the nation. They are deliberately and desperately selling out everything. Selling out gold to another country by one Government and the same being retrieved by another Government is a different thing. But selling out the property of the people without the sanction of the Parliament on the sweet will of a few Committees and a few individuals is a crime and fraud on the nation. Therefore, whatever this Government is doing, in the absence of a policy, in the name of disinvestment is a crime.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, now I would like to give you the glaring example of Air India.

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव (सम्भल) : यह अभी जवाब देकर आरोप लगा देंगे कि हम आपकी नीतियों का पालन कर रहे हैं।

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी : देवेगौड़ा सरकार ने जो नीति बनाई, उसमें कुछ हिस्सा हमारा और कुछ हिस्सा आपकी पार्टी का भी था। â€¦(व्यवधान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, advisors were chosen for Air India. I say it with a sense of responsibility and on the basis of the answers that have been given by the Government. I would like to request the friends of the NDA to please listen to me. It is more their issue than it is mine. You may campaign outside about it but you may not say anything about it here in this House. M/s G M Morgan and Stanley was chosen as the advisors for Air India. IDBI and ANZ Grindlays Bank were chosen as the advisors for Indian Airlines. Time and again we have been talking about these two basic carriers of the country --- Indian Airlines and Air India. These are the strategic carriers of the country approved by this Parliament and dreamt of by the people of this country at large. These carriers have earned profit for the last 46 years. Maybe, now they are in loss for the last five years. But the valuation of the properties of these two carriers should be planned together as a net asset and then the calculation for the bidding should start. Now, in spite of several interventions in Parliament by the Opposition, from the MPs of the NDA Government and even from the MPs of the Shiv Sena in particular, the Government has deliberately chosen − the Government knows its designs better − to select separate advisors for Indian Airlines and a separate advisor for Air India. Why is it so? I would now come to that.

Sir, there was an observation study made by Air India according to which Air India was definite to make a profit of Rs. 400 crore -- it was not just in the immediate present, it was for the last two years − subject to certain things to be done and approved by the Board. In the entire process of financial evaluation of Air India, the management of Air India has not been involved. The experts of Air India have not been involved. The Air India management has been kept in the dark. They are only being kept ready − as the management of the BALCO was kept ready − to sign the document in an emergency meeting whenever they would get the signal.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, whenever our hon. Prime Minister goes abroad and whenever he addresses the

audience either at abroad or in a rally of the BJP or in Government functions, he addresses them with conviction, courage and wisdom saying, `We the Indians', `We the citizens of India', `We the mighty nation of India' have come here to address you. I, as a citizen of this country, feel proud that my Prime Minister is boosting the image of the country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would like to ask one thing to the hon. Prime Minister. Could the hon. Prime Minister, or the Minister for Disinvestment for that matter, give me one example in any part of the world where any national carrier have had to come and operate under an umbrella of a foreign airline? Of course, there is one such example. It is Air Lanka. It is now operating under the shadow, a cover and umbrella of the United Arab Emirates Airways. But are we to be equated with United Arab Emirates or Sri Lanka?

Are we equal to Sri Lanka that Air India, which carries our national flag all over the world, should be subjugated to a foreign airlines? Our dream of all these years is being surrendered to foreign airlines in a deliberate and systematic process of devaluation of its assets, by manipulating stocks and by making the organisation sick deliberately. This is being done at a time when Prime Minister Vajpayee is going round saying that he is a patriot and proud of being an Indian. In the name of disinvestment this organisation is being sought to be handed over to some foreign group by devaluing the property in a systematic plan. It has become evident in the recent stock exchange scam as to how things are being manipulated. It is a thing to be ashamed of.

What prevented the Government from making an assessment of the worth of Air India as well as Indian Airlines together both inside and outside? The Government did not attempt that and there was further manipulation. If I had more time to speak I could have justified this. Internally the Government is trying to devalue the assets of Air India and Indian Airlines further so that they can get a strategic partner immediately. What prevented the Government from discussing the issue of disinvestment of Air India and Indian Airlines in the Standing Committee? If the Government had allowed it, they could at least have claimed that they sought the wisdom of the Standing Committee before deciding on such an important issue. The Government could have then placed it in Parliament and sought its approval. But they are not ready for that. The Government is vociferous in saying that the Parliament should function since Parliament is supreme. But, as far as disinvestment is concerned, the Government wants that Parliament should be bypassed. The Government feels that their strength lies not in the tears of the toiling masses but in the headcount among the NDA alliance partners. They feel that as long as they have the majority in Parliament they can have the seal of approval of Parliament. If an ally stops and says what the Government is doing is wrong, they would say that they would dissolve the Government and the country should be prepared for elections. This is the way they are running the Government! This is the way the Government are disposing of the task of disinvestment! This is the way they are trying to devalue the assets of public sector companies.

As far as telecom sector is concerned, the whole design of the Government is to make the VSNL and MTNL sick and sell these organisations away in the market through the process of disinvestment. This is what is there in the Telecom Policy which has been initiated when the recent Bill on the WLL came. These are matters which are being done in the name of disinvestment. These are matters which are agitating the nation. The Government feels that since they have a majority in Parliament they will get the approval of Parliament. Yet, the Government says that Parliament is supreme in terms of transparency, in terms of the actual exposition of facts ...(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN): Do you support WLL or do you oppose it?

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : When we come to setting up of a JPC on it, I will talk about it.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: What JPC? हम पूछ रहे हैं कि क्या आप डब्लयू.एल.एल. को सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं?

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी : क्या आपकी नींद टूट गई है? हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं कि आपने जो किया, ठीक नहीं किया है।

श्री राम विलास पासवानः क्या कांग्रेस पार्टी इसे अपोज़ कर रही है?

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी : मैं आपसे कह रहा हूं कि आपने जो किया है, वह तहलका.काम से 40 गुना ज्यादा बड़ा है। इसके लिये आपको भुगतना पड़ेगा, उसके लिये आप तैयार रहिये।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मैंने कहा था कि *

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Sir, the Minister has no right to talk like that. What does he mean?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Minister you cannot do that.

श्री राम विलास पासवानः यह गांवों के हित में है, क्या कांग्रेस पार्टी के हित में नहीं है?

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी :गांव के गरीब 15 हजार रुपए में मोबाईल खरीदेंगे और वे आपकी कांस्टीट्वंसी में होगा? आप क्या बात करते हैं?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That should not go on record.

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी : अभी आपके टापिक पर बहस नहीं हो रही है, आप क्यों उत्तेजित हो रहे हैं? आपकी इसमें इंडिविजुअल राय नहीं ली गई, यह पालिसी की बात है।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कहां की बहस हो रही हैâ€¦(व्यवधान)

ये किनके हाथो में खेल खेल रहे हैं, ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, I am not yielding.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record except Shri Dasmunsi.

***(Interruptions)* ***

*** Not Recorded***

श्री राजेश रंजन उर्फ पप्पू यादव : जो पूंजीपति लोग बोलेंगे क्या हम भी वही बोलेंगे।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जब आपकी बारी आयेगी तब आप बोलियेगा।

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pappu Yadav, he is not yielding.

...(*Interruptions*)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जब आपकी बारी आयेगी तब आप बोलियेगा।

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pappu Yadav, you have to behave in the House. Do not interrupt. Please resume your seat.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record except the speech of Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi.

***(Interruptions)* ***

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is not an individual matter. It is a matter of policy we are discussing and debating....(*Interruptions*)â€¦In the case of Hindustan Zinc Limited, again an effort has been made to disinvest it. Is it not a fact? The Minister will say while replying that "is it not the Congress who initiated the disinvestment?" He will definitely say that, "is the Congress opposed to disinvestment?" My answer is, "no". We are never saying that we are opposed to disinvestemnt....(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pappu Yadav, you have to behave well in the House. There should not be any running commentary.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: On any thing and every thing, you stand up and start speaking. It is not proper.

...(*Interruptions*)

*** Not Recorded**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record except the speech of Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi.

(Interruptions) *

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Sir, in the process of disinvestment, a few companies are chosen. Then, the Minister will say, "is it not the Congress who had started disinvestment?" Yes, we say again emphatically that in the process of economic reforms, disinvestment cannot be ruled out. We emphatically say that Disinvestment Commission's recommendations which were made, were not mandatory on the part of the Cabinet. And, during our regime, we did not disinvest 26 per cent or 40 per cent or 51 per cent. It was much less than that. In some strategic sectors like BPCL and a few other units, we did it.

What we have been saying in terms of the policy is that the while the Government is committed to invest this amount for social sector, for restructuring the PSUs, is it not proper on the part of the Government, as a policy, to see that the profit-making units, which are going way ahead to capture the market both inside and outside, in the strategic sector of petroleum like Indian Oil, BPCL and Hindustan Petroleum, should not be encouraged or pressurised to disinvest their total worth in more than 41 per cent at this stage? Otherwise, it will have a ruinous effect on the entire nation's economy after ten years because, Sir, the petroleum sector is the only sector where the pubic sector units have shown tremendous hopes, tremendous encouragement and tremendous responses for the interest of the nation. But here also, the policy of the Government is not clear.

1558 hours (Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav *in the Chair*)

Sir, what is their design? If the attempt which they have made in the case of IBP, is followed up in the case of BPCL and the IOL -- the Hon. Minister of Petroleum is sitting there -- I am worried what will happen to the nation. These are the areas where they are trying to have disinvestment.

Therefore, in our Document at the Bangalore session, we made it abundantly clear that we are not averse to disinvestment *per se* but a caution should be there that 51 per cent or more in the profit-making units should not be disinvested. We put a cap, a cap not on the Congress or Communist or BJP, that the nation should be ensured to protect its progress and programmes where it is achieving the highest goals. But why do they keep quiet on this issue? They should also come out clearly saying that, "yes, these are the areas where our mind is clear and transparent." That is what we want and nothing more than that. But they are not coming out.

Here, we have prepared the Document stating where you like to do 26 per cent, where you like to do 30 per cent and where you do not like to do it.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, they referred to the disinvestment done from the Chandra shekhar Government to the Davegowda Government. If they are referring it, they should also see that no Government in the past -- little or big − did the disinvestment on the strategic sector or even on the sick public sector units to more than 26 per cent.

16.00 hrs.

You have jumped it. In the case of BALCO, it was above 50 per cent. You are considering disinvestment above forty per cent in the banking sector. Can you cope with the international banks? Have you not seen what happened to the Global Trust Bank after the disaster in the stock markets? They have severed their ties with the UTI, leaving it in the lurch. Can you reply to these questions? This is a dangerous route. You do not have a clear-cut policy.

What is your policy on coal, if you treat it as a strategic sector? What is your policy on power? I can understand, you are confused by this document. You have said that 100 per cent FDI would be allowed in the power sector. We do not say that it should not be done. We say that in the public sector, including the power sector, there has to be a policy. What is your policy for profit-making units? What is your policy for loss-making units? You are not clear till date on this. You have simply said that whoever comes with 100 per cent investment would be allowed. But who has come?

I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister and also take advantage of the presence of the hon. Prime Minister. Except this Parliament building and a few other buildings, almost all of them have been built after Independence, brick by brick. But the fact is that the cement industry of this country is languishing. We have had the Bhakra Nangal project. We have had dams and projects from Thungabadra

to Bhakra Nangal. We have had our cement industry selling its cement to all these projects. They are languishing for the last five to six years. Did you ever study this aspect? Lafarge came on the scene but did they bring at least a single French Franc with them? No. They did not invest even a single penny. They got some of these units at throwaway prices. They compelled them to bring down the prices as the market was down. They captured the industry and now the prices have shot up. They are making money from our own PFI to buy other units. Did they bring in any investment? This is what we call looting; this is what we call non-transparent activity leading to wrong track. After Lafarge, Bluebell is coming. Here also, it is going to be the same thing. Are they having any new plant for Lafarge cement? No. They are buying Raymond, ACC and are investing in all the units where 41 per cent to 51 per cent investments were by PFI. By taking further money from PFI, they are buying those units. Is it proper? Do you consider it justified? Do you not listen to the slogans of your own Swadeshi Jagran Manch? This is dangerous and would lead us to a disaster. Therefore, I would say that your policies are wrong. They are not transparent. ...(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DISINVESTMENT, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION, AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS AND PUBLIC GRIEVANCES OF THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS

(SHRI ARUN SHOURIE): I want to clarify just one point. I was not able to follow the cement examples that you were giving. Is there any plant in the public sector that has been disinvested? ...(*Interruptions*)

सभापति महोदय : माननीय मंत्री जी आप उत्तर देते समय बताएं।

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : No. I am not saying that.

You have tactfully clubbed it here under the policies of the Government in case of 100 per cent FDIs and in the case of selective disinvestment. Even if you say that there is going to be 100 per cent disinvestment, it is not correct. I have given you two examples of how the foreign investors are behaving when they come to India in the name of investments. I remember, I said it the other day during the debate on the last Finance Bill. It would be proved tomorrow. I said that day that the so-called stock exchange of Bombay was nothing but a casino for a few foreign players at the cost of our small investors. This is what is taking place in the case of disinvestment also. You are following a casual approach. You are doing it in an *ad hoc* manner. I gave you the example of BALCO; I do not want to repeat what the SEBI has said on BALCO.

For the benefit of the hon. Prime Minister, I would just read out two lines of my dear friend, colleague and hon. Minister, Shri Arun Shourie, who finally said:

> "Globally, the roots of state intervention in economic activities in the previous century can perhaps be traced back to the early 1930s when in the wake of the Great Depression Roosevelt tried to rein in the dubious behaviour of the wayward private enterprise â€¦ "

There, he says that the Western economy as a way of privatisation is yielding results. But he could not avoid saying that after the Great War, the French did not follow that policy for a substantial period in the strategic sector and later on developed. He compared the post-Independent India's position or the developing world's position with the economy of US or with the economy of France and Britain; and all of a sudden, he tried to justify that this is the path by which he could do.

If that is the only solution, why have many private banking companies been wound up? Why have many private airlines been closed down? He has to say it with a rationale. He has made a blanket policy saying that disinvestment means privatisation. In the policy document, it is there, Mr. Prime Minister. I think, you have not read it. Shri Arun Shourie placed it before the Cabinet. According to him, disinvestment means privatisation. He said it. Is it the policy of the Government that disinvestment means total privatisation? I do not know how you are functioning. You are not functioning cohesively as a Cabinet, to present the policy documents to Parliament. You are functioning in a very casual or cavalier manner, Department-wise. If the Communication Minister feels something, he decides; if the Disinvestment Minister feels something, he decides; and when there is a crisis, it will be referred to the Group of Ministers. Till there is no crisis, he keeps quiet. This is the way the Government is discharging its responsibilities to the nation and to Parliament. I am sorry to say this.

Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by saying three things: (a) during the course of reply, he may please

clarify and say what is the comprehensive policy, as per the observations of the Standing Committee's report, placed on the Table of the House and when it is coming. (b) he may please explain what action he is now going to take against Sterlite to whom the Government sold the property worth Rs.10,000 crore, for Rs.500 and odd crore and which has been charged by the Government's own agency, SEBI. (c) may I know whether he is prepared to combine the assessment of Indian Airlines and Air India and send the report to the Standing Committee of Parliament so that the Standing Committee could scan it and see whether disinvestment should be done through bidding process, etc.? Will he wait for this and take a decision later? Or he would prefer to do it immediately after the Parliament recess, ignoring Parliament, and again, come back to Parliament.

These are the few questions that he has to answer.

श्री किरीट सोमैया (मुम्बई उत्तर पूर्व) : सम्माननीय सभापदि जी, मैं आपकी अनुमति से माननीय प्रिय रंजन दासमुंशी जी से एक जानकारी प्राप्त करना चाहता हूं । वे हमारे अच्छे मित्र हैं। इसलिए मुझे विश्वास है कि वे बताएंगे। मैं उनसे यह जानना चाहता हूं माननीय मुंशी जी कि आप अपनी कांग्रेस पार्टी में क्या कभी डिसइनवैस्टमेंट की चर्चा करते हैं? यदि आप डिसइनवैस्टमेंट पर चर्चा करते, तो यहां आप थोड़ी गंभीरता से बोलते। यदि आपने पालिसीज के ऊपर, 1990 में जब आपने इकनौमी खोली, यदि आप उस समय ठीक प्रकार से डिसीजन लेते और कांग्रेस का ठीक प्रकार से इनवैस्टमेंट होता, तो 1985 में कांग्रेस पार्टी के सांसदों की संख्या 401 से 195 और 1996 में 136 तथा 1999 में 113 पर नहीं पहुंचती। यदि आप इसी प्रकार की अपनी सोच रखेंगे, तो मुझे कोई शंका नहीं कि आप शीघ्र ही डबल डिजिट पर पहुंचने वाले हैं। हम भी लोक तंत्र में यह विश्वास रखते हैं कि सत्ताधारी पक्ष के साथ-साथ विपक्ष भी अच्छा होना चाहिए, मजबूत होना चाहिए और समझदार होना चाहिए।

इसलिए हमारी प्रार्थना है कि जो विभिन्न पालिसीज होती हैं, उसके ऊपर उदाहरण देते समय चाहे लाफॉज़ की बात हो, एयर इंडिया की बात हो या सोशल सैक्टर की बात हो, शायद हम अपनी नीति के बारे में पहले सोच लेते। काश प्रियरंजन दास मुंशी जी ने आज जो बात कही, वह 1991 से 1995 जिस समय आपने हिन्दुस्तान के दरवाजे खोल दिये थे, जिस समय आपने डिसइन्वेस्टमैंट प्रारंभ किया, जिस समय आपने गवर्नमैंट मोनोपोलिस्टिक पब्लिक सैक्टर अंडरटेकिंग का कारपोरेटाइजेशन किये बगैर, प्राइवेटाइजेशन प्रारंभ कर दिया, ग्लोबलाइजेशन शुरू कर दिया और आपने डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में जाकर हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के हाथ काटकर रख दिये, उस समय आपने यह भााण किया होता तो शायद आज लाफॉज़ का लार्फिंग उदाहरण देने की आपको नौबत नहीं आती। लाफॉज़ की पालिसी किसने बनाई ? क्या माननीय अरुण शौरी जी ने बनाई ? Who opened the door? आपने ये दरवाजे खोल दिये। आपने डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में जाकर साईन कर दिये और आपने मल्टी नैशनल कम्पनीज को हिन्दुस्तान की सब जगह पर, किसी भी सैक्टर में, किसी भी इंडस्ट्रीज में आने का रास्ता दिखा दिया और अब आप यह कह रहे हैं। आप 1996 से 1998 तक जब लेफ्ट फ्रंट की सरकार थी, उस समय आपका यह ब्रह्मज्ञान कहां गया था ? उस समय आपने यह बात क्यों नहीं की। काश उस समय आपने यह आग्रह किया होता। The recommendations of the Disinvestment Commission must be implemented in toto. लेकिन आप भूल गये। आपकी पार्टी ने आग्रह किया कि डिसइन्वेस्टमैंट कमीशन बने। उनकी जो रिकमेंडेशन है, वह वैसी की वैसी मानी जाये।

प्रियरंजन दास मुंशी जी, आपकी जानकारी के लिए डिसइन्वेस्टमैंट कमीशन ने सबसे पहली कम्पनी का नाम अगर कोई लिखा होगा कि उसका डिसइन्वेस्टमैंट तुरंत ही करना है तो उस कम्पनी का नाम एयर इंडिया होगा। तब आपकी देशभक्ति, आपकी नैशनल फ्लैगशिप, आपका महाराजा कहां गया ? इसीलिए आप सोशल सैक्टर की बात कर रहे हैं। मैं उस मुद्दे पर जाना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि माननीय शिवराज पाटिल जी अच्छी तरह से समझ पायेंगे कि हमारे महाराट्र में हर साल गणपति, गणेश उत्सव होता है। जब हम गणपति जी का विसर्जन करने जाते हैं तब ऐसा कहते हैं कि "गणपति भप्पा मोरैया, पुरचा वर्शी लोकड़िया।" डिसइन्वेस्टमैंट के बारे में कांग्रेस का नजरिया कुछ समझ में नहीं आता। उनके हर अधिवेशन में वही चर्चा, वही डिसइन्वेस्टमैंट, वही मुद्दा यानी कभी ऐसा कहते हैं कि Old wine in new bottle. लेकिन कांग्रेस की वाइन भी ओल्ड है और वॉटर भी ओल्ड है। आप उनके गये पांच अधिवेशनों की चर्चा निकाल लें। इस अधि वेशन में तो और भी चमत्कार है। अधिवेशन के पहले हिस्से में बाल्को के नाम पर डिसइन्वेस्टमैंट की चर्चा और अभी डिपार्टमैंट की मांग को लेकर डिसइन्वेस्टमैंट की चर्चा। उस कम्पनी के कामगार या वहां रहने वाले जो भी बालक होंगे, वे भी बोलेंगे कि बालकों जैसी बात हो गई है। मैं बाल्कों पर ज्यादा चर्चा नहीं करना चाहता हूं क्योंकि इस पर पहले काफी चर्चा हो चुकी है लेकिन मुझे एक बात समझ में नहीं आई। What we want to insist? 1991 से 1995 तक आपने क्या किया, उसकी लिस्ट आप देख लीजिए। श्री अरुण जेटली जी ने गये बार यह जवाब दिया था इसलिए वह लिस्ट मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूं। सोशल सैक्टर की बात करते हैं तो 1991 से 1995 मतक आपने जिस प्र ाकार से डिसइन्वेस्टमैंट किया, तब क्या किया? एक कम्पनी के शेयर, सभी पब्लिक सैक्टर अंडरटेकिंग्स के शेयर के जो भाव थे, उससे ज्यादा दाम पर आपने म्युचुअल फंड को बेच दिये।

आपने यूनिट ट्रस्ट को बेचा, आई.डी.बी.आई. को बेचा और उसके कारण यूनिट ट्रस्ट को 3300 करोड़ रुपये का जो नुकसान हुआ, वह नॉन-इन्वैस्टर यानी सोशल सैक्टर के हिस्से से गया। इसलिए उस विाय में मैं ज्यादा नहीं जाना चाहता। लेकिन एक बात जरूर कहना चाहूंगा कि जैसा मैंने कहा - गणपति बप्पा मोरिया, अगली बार भी आप मानसून सैशन में डिसइन्वैस्टमैंट की चर्चा करवाएंगे, उस समय अच्छी तरह थोड़ा होम वर्क करके आएंगे तो कांग्रेस का डिसइन्वैस्टमैंट जो थोड़ा नीचे जा रहा है, वह थोड़ा रुक जाएगा क्योंकि पांच विधान सभा के चुनाव आ रहे हैं, उतना और आपका डिसइन्वैस्टमैंट होगा।

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी : वह तो आपको 13 तारीख रात को पता लगेगा।â€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री किरीट सोमैया : स्टारलाइट पर मंत्री जी ज्यादा उत्तर देंगे लेकिन कांग्रेस के नेता से मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि यह हिम्मत सिर्फ श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी की एन.डी.ए. की सरकार में है। हंदि मेहता से लेकर अनेक कांड आपके जमाने में हुए, आपने एक भी प्रमोटर और कम्पनी के मालिक के सामने एक्शन नहीं लिया था। अगर यह एक्शन लिया है तो एन.डी.ए. की सरकार ने लिया है। ये एक्शन हमारी सरकार में हुए। हम सोचते नहीं हैं, हम रैगुलेटर्स के बीच में दखल नहीं देते। * इसलिए ट्रांसपेरैंसी और अनेक जो मुद्दे आपने उठाए हैं, मुझे लगता है कि एक विाय पर मैं थोड़ा ध्यान दूंगा। We must think and when I say 'we' मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि मैं थोड़ा पोलीटिक्स से ऊपर उठना

चाहता हूं। मैं बी.जे.पी., कांग्रेस या थर्ड फ्रंट, When we talk about disinvestment or when we discuss that the profit-making institutions or companies should not go for disinvestment आपने वही किया था। उस मुद्दे में भी मैं नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन दासमुंशी जीâ€¦(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य, आप दलों से ऊपर उठ कर बोलना चाहते हैं या पोलीटिक्स से ऊपर उठना चाहते है।

श्री किरीट सोमैया : मैं डिसइन्वैस्टमैंट के संबंध में â€¦(व्यवधान)

कर्नल (सेवानिवृत्त) सोना राम चौधरी (बाड़मेर) : आप कमेटी में कुछ और बोलते हैं और यहां कुछ और बोलते हैं।â€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री किरीट सोमैया : मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि प्रॉफिट मेकिंग कन्सर्न जब घाटे में चली जाए तब हम डिसइन्वैस्टमैंट करेंगे। मैं आपको एम.टी.एन.एल. का एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूं। एम.टी.एन.एल. ने डॉलफिन मोबाइल सर्विस चालू की। मुम्बई में क्या पोजीशन है? I am not criticising the Ministry or the management of the company but we must think क्योंकि हमने पब्लिक सैक्टर अंडरटेकिंग्स को ऐफीशिऐंसी प्रोफैशनल मैनेजमैंट, यह अचानक उनके सामने कर दिया। दो महीने में डॉलफिन ने सिर्फ साढ़े छः हजार कस्टमर बनाए हैं। प्राइवेट सैक्टर कम्पनी जो वहां आ गई, वह इस प्रकार से जम गई है।

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

श्री चन्द्र बाबू नायडू ने भाण दिया, उनकी बहुत सुन्दर स्पीच है।â€¦(व्यवधान) मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि श्री चन्द्र बाबू नायडू ने इस विाय में भरी सभा में भाग लेते समय जो कहा ---

"Over the years, however, degeneration set in the working of the public sector undertakings, both at the Central and State levels; PSUs lost their autonomy; and professional management subjected to political and bureaucratic interference. The PSUs today suffer from structural constraints to delay in decision makingâ€¦."

उन्होंने एक और जगह पर कहा है ---

"And with the virtual collapse of Indian economy in early nineties, we started on the path of liberalisation, adopted delicensing, and privatisation as an important component of economic reform programme. Unfortunately, there has been lack of clarity at political level on the privatisation policy. It is unfortunate that the political parties are unable to take a clear stand on privatisation and disinvestment."

मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करना चाहूंगा कि हम और कुछ आंकड़ों में जाएंगे। डिसइन्वैस्टमैंट इन स्टेट तो हमारे ध्यान में आएगा कि सबसे ज्यादा प्र ापोजल अगर डिसइन्वैस्टमैंट इन स्टेट में कहीं आ रहे हैं, मैं तीनों मुख्य मंत्रियों को बधाई दूंगा।

एक तो कर्नाटक से आ रहे हैं और दूसरे मध्य प्रदेश से आ रहे हैं। आप चाहें तो मैं फीगर्स भी बता सकता हूं। In Karnataka, 77 public sector undertakings are there and 17 undertakings have been identified for disinvestment. The process of disinvestment has been initiated in 16 cases. In Madhya Pradesh, the number of State level public sector undertakings is 34. Of this, 27 have been identified for disinvestment including Madhya Pradesh Road Transport Corporation and Madhya Pradesh Finance Corporation. लेकिन मैं उन मुख्यमंत्रियों को बधाई देना चाहूंगा और इसीलिए मैं कहता हूं कि हम अर्थशास्त्र की चर्चा आर्थिक दायरे में रहकर करें और राजनीति पर जब चर्चा करें तो राजनीति से प्रेरित होकर करें।

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, I only asked what is the comprehensive disinvestment policy of the Government in regard to profit making sector, sick sector, strategic and core sector which are going ahead and in the interest of the workers. I wanted to know what is the precise policy. He is trying to confuse it. I think, we have never said that we are opposed to disinvestment *per se*. We have never said this from the Congress side.

SHRI KIRIT SOMAIYA: Sir, I think he is confused himself. When he would go through his speech, he would find that on the one side, he is criticising the Government and on the other side, he is not able to uphold the decisions taken by his previous Government.

दूसरी बात डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट होना चाहिए, मैं स्पट तौर पर कहना चाहूंगा, कम्पनीज लासेज में जाएंगी, तब तक ठहरो मत। आपने मारुति का सौ रुपये का शेयर 269 में बेचा, इन अर्ली नाइंटीज हिन्दुस्तान मोटर्स का भाव 769 रुपये था, अभी कहां हिन्दुस्तान मोटर्स है और कहां मारुति है। लेकिन मारुति का शेयर बेचा और भारत मां रोती रही कि लूट कौन रहा था, लेकिन मैं उस सम्बन्ध में नहीं जाना चाहूंगा, क्योंकि मैं थोड़ा हैल्दी डिस्कशन करना चाहता हूं। मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि अब दूरदर्शन की बात लीजिए। You can have only two types of alternatives.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : The entire motor industry got modernised because of Maruti Udyog Limited.

SHRI KIRIT SOMAIYA : We can have only two types of economic system. One is the socio-economic pattern which we had up to early 1990s and the other is privatisation, liberalisation, and WTO-based

globalisation which we have adopted now.

सभापति महोदय : अब आप कन्क्लूड कीजिए।

SHRI KIRIT SOMAIYA : The Government of India under the leadership of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has never said कि यह तो पहली सरकार ने किया था, कांग्रेस सरकार ने एग्रीमेंट किया था, उसे हम नहीं मानेंगे। जो आपने किया, वह ठीक है। वह गवर्नमेंट ऑफ इंडिया द्वारा सिग्नेचर किया हुआ एग्रीमेंट था। जब हमने दरवाजे खोल दिये तो हमारे जो पब्लिक सैक्टर एण्टरप्राइजेज को अपना काम करने दो। अभी आपने बैंकिंग सैक्टर की बात की। फॉरेन बैंक्स को किसने परमीशन दी? You allowed foreign banks to enter into India. और अब आप हमारे पब्लिक सैक्टर एण्टरप्राइजेज को अगर कारपोरेटाइज करके इंडिपेंडेंट नहीं करेंगे, वह स्ट्रेटेजिक सैक्टर पार्टनर नहीं ढूंढेगा तो कैसे काम होगा। जब हम पॉलिसी की बात करते हैं, This is the first time. यह इस प्रकार से हुआ है।

SHRI A.C. JOS (TRICHUR): You kindly say something about disinvestment.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is about to conclude. You please take your seat.

श्री किरीट सोमैया : मैं आपको एक और उदाहरण देना चाहूंगा।

सभापति महोदय : सौमैया जी, अब कन्क्लूड कीजिए, आपकी समय सीमा समाप्त हो गई।

श्री किरीट सोमैया : सभापति जी, वे मुझे बोलने नहीं दे रहे थे, वे बीच में मेरा समय ले रहे थे। मैं केवल तीन मिनट और लूंगा। मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि यह पहली गवर्नमेंट है, जिसने इसके महत्व को समझा है। आपकी बात सही है कि पहली बार गवर्नमेंट में ग्राण्ट के ऊपर डिस्कस करने का आपको मौका मिल रहा है, क्योंकि 9-10 साल में किसी गवर्नमेंट ने इसको अलग डिपार्टमेंट बनाने का महत्व नहीं समझा। उन्होंने अलग उसकी नीति नहीं बनाई, उसके लिए अलग बजट नहीं बनाया।

Yes, I do agree that we should discuss the comprehensive policy. The hon. Minister has said several times that there is a special Department which has its strategic policy. We are prepared to discuss it. We have no problem about it. लेकिन जब हम डिस्कशन करें तो मेरी इतनी ही प्रार्थना है कि हम खुले मन से करें, फिर उस समय हम इस प्रकार का विचार न रखें कि यह कैसे हो रहा है, वहां कैसा हो रहा है।

अंत में मैं वैस्ट बंगाल का एक उदाहरण देकर अपनी बात को समाप्त करूंगा। पब्लिक सेक्टर के एंटरप्राइजेज़ का आपने प्राइवेटाइजेशन और ग्लोबलाइजेशन शुरू किया। What is the situation in West Bengal? Of 48 companies, 42 companies are making losses and Rs.1574 crore of losses have been accumulated. उसके सामने शेयर केपिटल 310 करोड़ रुपए है। The total investment is to the tune of Rs.10,632 crore. वैस्ट बंगाल सरकार को 0.047 प्रतिशत डिवीडेंड मिल रहा है। मैं इतना ही कहना चाहूंगा कि डिसइंवेस्टमेंट की एक अच्छी पालिसी होनी चाहिए और उस पर चर्चा करनी चाहिए। लेकिन हम पर जो कम्प्लशन आ गया, उसको ध्यान में रखकर, हम सरकारी क्षेत्र के एंटरप्राइजेज़ को ज्यादा से ज्यादा ध्यान देकर सरकारी तंत्र से मुक्त करेंगे तो हम लाखों-करोड़ों रुपए का बचाव करेंगे।

PROF. A.K. PREMAJAM (BADAGARA): Mr. Chairman, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

The representative of the main Opposition, Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunshi and the representative from the ruling NDA, Shri Kirit Somaiya have already spoken on the Demands for Grants of the Department of Disinvestment. While following the speeches of these two hon. Members representing the two sides, I felt that they were passing the buck to each other, without going into the relevant Demands.

In regard to the policy of disinvestment of this Government, I oppose it from the general point of view as also in respect of this Demand in particular. While observing the working of the Department of Disinvestment in particular and the working of the NDA Government led by BJP in general, I find that this Government does not have any direction or purpose as far as disinvestment is concerned. It is seen quite often that this Government has been very touchy whenever this topic is raised in the House. They are going about disinvestment in a callous manner with total indifference to the interest of the country at large. In respect of these disinvestment decisions, they are making all transactions without any transparency.

Whenever this topic is raised in the House, they will say that this has been initiated by the Congress Government in 1991 with the new economic policy and that they are just continuing it. They will also refer to the same point of argument in respect of the UF Government also saying that the UF Government also had done the same thing. But, I would like to remind the Government that when they went to the people for a mandate both in the elections for the Twelfth and the Thirteenth Lok Sabha, they were raising a slogan that they were different from others who had been in power till then in independent India and given a chance they would give a different type of Government and a very clean Government at that.

Now it has been disproved that they are different. It has also been disproved that they would be able to

give a clean Government. I am not going into the details of what happened in the last three years when they have been ruling both as the caretaker Government as also the full-fledged Government. The recent transactions in the field of disinvestment in respect of Maruti Udyog Limited and BALCO will reveal what has been going on.

Whenever this issue is raised, they say that the interest of the workers are taken care of and there is a safety network for the employees. This House is aware that the workers of BALCO are on strike and are on a very strong agitation. Their family members are also on agitation for the last 50 days. My point is, if the interests of the labourers and employees have been taken care of, then where is the question of agitation by the working class employed in any undertaking? Here, the example is BALCO. And there is nothing to say about the clandestine manner in which these transactions on BALCO had been made.

As regards Maruti Udyog Limited, for nearly three months, there was a strike going on. When there was severe cold, the employees of Maruti Udyog Limited had been on strike in the open. We had gone there to meet them and reveal our association with their cause. The Government was dragging on its leg during those days of strike. And if they had any interest on the working class and on the entire country at large, that would not have been so. Sir, they are people who raise slogans about *swadeshi* and now, they are exclusively in favour of *videshi.* That is what is revealed day after day.

Coming back to the interest of the employees, what is the safety network? We would like to have concrete details about the safety network which is proposed to be formulated by the Government in respect of the employees working in the undertakings going in for disinvestment. So far, at least I do not know whether there is any safety network already formulated by this Government or not. If it had been so, then there would not have been any reason for the employees of BALCO to go on agitation for such a long time.

About the clandestine manner in which these transactions are made, I am not going into those details. But I may just mention one point which may be a repetition of what Shri Dasmunsi had already referred to. In the recent scam of stock market and shares, M/s Sterlite is also involved. It is this Company which has got control over the BALCO now. Moreover, in the case of BALCO, the Constitution is violated because it is actually having tribal land with them. What is the answer for this point? The Government must answer this question. It is a constitutional violation. Tribal land is involved here. When BALCO is transferred, it is transferred to Sterlite Company. The Government is bound to give an answer to this question. It is not only that. There is a Report submitted before Parliament. The point here is, whether the workers have been consulted or not. I want to know whether the employees are consulted at any stage or at any level when the disinvestment process is made.

This Government is a bundle of contradictions also. As far as the aim of disinvestment is concerned, they say it is to release of scarce financial resources for development in social sectors like family welfare, health, education and other sectors which are of great public interest. Of course, it is a good thing, if it is done so. Now, I would quote from page 17 of the Budget speech of 1999-2000. It says:

> **"I propose to raise Rs.10,000 crore through the disinvestment programme. This will help the Government to fund the requirements of social and infrastructure sectors."**
>
> **"Equally import, it will lead to improvements in productivity and profitability of these enterprises and also to the further development of domestic capital markets"**

Actually, according to the *Economic Survey*, 2000-2001, only Rs.1,829 crore had been raised through this method. That is another thing. But, in the same Budget speech, regarding education and health care, the speech is in the following manner. I will quote only the education part of it.

> **"I propose to implement an Education Guarantee Scheme at the National level. The aim will be to provide an elementary school in every habitation which does not have one within a radius of one kilometre. Initially, the local community would provide the premises and select a local person as a part-time teacher."**

The point is that if it works for two years, of course, the Government grant will be given and the State Governments also have to give this grant. If the proceeds from the disinvestment process are utilised for the social sector, where is the need for this kind of a suggestion or this kind of a direction? So, this is a contradiction. The Government's intention is questioned here. The Government had no intention to

invest this money in social sector. If it had any intention, there would have been no need for this type of a statement made in the Budget speech. Similar is the case with Health Care also.

Now, I would like to know one more thing. When the profit-making enterprises had been nationalised just after Independence, when they had grown into very large public undertakings, they were making a profit. Actually, when that process was done, it was done with the knowledge and sanction of the Parliament. But now when those public sector undertakings are sold or when they are undergoing disinvestment process, the Parliament is not even taken into confidence. That is why, I said that it is done in a clandestine manner. So, I would like to know why the Government has not taken the Parliament into confidence when these public sector undertakings are being sold. Mr. Minister, you will say that the policy has already been formulated and all those things. But I would like to have a very concrete substantiation of this point also.

With these words, I conclude.

DR. B.B. RAMAIAH (ELURU): Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I would like to state that the Disinvestment Policy which we are discussing now was introduced first in 1991. We all know the circumstances under which it had been introduced and also the purpose for which it had been introduced.

When it was introduced, the Government set up a Cabinet Sub-Committee under the Chairmanship of the hon. Prime Minister. From 1991 to 1996, their plan was to make some amounts through the disinvestment process. For some years, they could not even do anything at all. Subsequently, from 1996 onwards, the Government thought that they should have expertise in this regard and the Disinvestment Committee was formed to go into certain aspects very deeply. They wanted to go into the merits and demerits, the purpose for which they were doing it etc. The investment made in respect of the total public sector undertakings was nearly about Rs.2,40,000 crore. There are about 160 units which are trying to make profit. There are about 75 manufacturing units, that is, 75 service units. So, taking all of them together, the profit-making units come to more than hundred and the loss-making units come to much more than that. The purpose for which they were doing is to see how to streamline these things; how to improve the performance of these units. They further wanted to know whether the technology has been upgraded or not; whether the training programmes have improved or not; whether the units are over-burdened with labour and what is the method in which they have to do all these things. First, they would also have to see whether the budgetary support is enough or not. At the same time, the deficit financing is also going up. Finally, the economic reforms are a part of disinvestment also.

What happened in the case of disinvestment over the last nine years? Though the aim is to raise about Rs.50,000 crore, yet, hardly, they could raise about Rs.18,395 crore only.

There are issues that are going to be serious, and we have to consider the same, namely, fluctuations in stock market; fluctuations in the shares of these organisations. We mainly want to see that the funds of the disinvestment must be utilised for the welfare of the labour. We should also be able to see as to how best improve the existing units. We have to categorise these units - as to whether to renew, privatise or wind up these units which would ultimately strengthen the economy, and to see that productivity goes up.

Today, we are facing competition internationally. We also have to face this competition at the same level. People are looking for quality, price and availability. Public sector has not been given enough funds for reorganisation. There are some units which could be reorganised. By giving more powers to the management, Indian Telephone Industries, Bharat Electronics Limited, etc. have lost heavily the moment reforms were introduced. They could liberalise because the controls of Government have reduced. They could utilise their own manpower and equipment substantially to recover and improve the performance. Some units have improved their R & D also. The purchase preference, which was given to all these public sector undertakings, is not working properly. Otherwise, all these units would have also improved. The purpose for which we are disinvesting is not to wind up all these units.

The Disinvestment Commission have submitted 12 reports. They have identified various units that have to be disinvested, as to what percentage we have to disinvest, whether it is 26 per cent or 50 per cent or 49 per cent or even 74 per cent. Categorisation is more important. More than anything else, what are we going to do with this amount? Everybody wants transparency. Transparency is very important. There should not be anything secretive in whatever transaction that is going on. The Committee that is going into disinvestment should have a lot of knowledge, experience, which can utilise the talent by trying to get the best price, and at the best time. The time will always change.

The stock scam, that is happening today, is going to be one of the biggest problems that we are facing. In spite of that, there are some units which could survive. Whether it is globalisation or the WTO, it is an on-going process. Irrespective of whichever party has introduced it, everyone should take the responsibility. There are pluses and minuses. In the larger interest of the country, everyone has to see as to what best we can utilise these funds. The world is becoming so close. We cannot be in isolation; we cannot live in isolation. We cannot think that we can live outside globalisation, the WTO. We need to compete. The common man looks for quality and price. We have to satisfy them. In the process, a number of things has happened.

We have the problem of overstaffing in some of these units. In this regard, VRS has been introduced. We have to use some portion of the disinvestment funds for the VRS. Even in the banking sector, we have introduced VRS. Unless we reduce the staff, we cannot be competitive. Unless we are competitive, we cannot be economical. The purpose is as to how to improve the public sector undertakings. Various methods are required; expert committees are required. Transparency is more important. We should see as to how best we can utilise the funds. Whatever we have collected so far is a small amount and is negligible. Some of the members have also mentioned that we have to take care of education, medical purposes, and various social obligations. We have to evolve guidelines and formulations. Whether it is a matter of disinvestment in Air India or Indian Airlines or some other big organisation, we have to see as to what method we have to adopt, etc. The Committee has given a number of reports on various goals and merits.

We have to see as to what is the best way that we have to follow. The Parliament has got the responsibility to see that there is transparency in the process of disinvestment, we have the right to go into the merits of the cases and then we can say that this is what is happening.

Sir, I know that disinvestment has to continue and there is no alternative. They have already recommended about 48 public sector undertakings for disinvestment like MTNL, Air India etc. Whatever be the organisations that are listed for disinvestment, I hope that all the aspects that I just mentioned would be taken into consideration. I am sure that the hon. Minister would definitely see that the Expert Committee is given all the powers. Then, it should be open for the Parliament to study all these things and see how best it can be done.

श्री रामजीलाल सुमन (फिरोजाबाद) : सभापति जी, आज हम विनिवेश की अनुदानों की मांगों पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं और इससे पहले भी विनिवेश के सवाल पर इस सदन में तीन-चार बार चर्चा हुई है। माननीय सदस्य सुझाव देते हैं, बहस करते हैं और माननीय अरुण शौरी जी अच्छी अंग्रेजी बोलकर मामले को उड़ा देते हैं। मैंने पहले भी बड़ी विनम्रता के साथ आपसे निवेदन किया था कि सबसे बड़ी चिंता की बात यह है कि आम आदमी के सवाल पर संसद अपनी सार्थकता खोती जा रही है। जहां तक विनिवेश का सवाल है हमारे देश में 235 प्रतिठानों में से 127 वे हैं जो मुनाफा कमा रहे हैं और शेा घाटे में हैं। ये प्रतिठान पैसे के कारण घाटे में नहीं चल रहे हैं बल्कि मिसमैनेजमेंट और लालफीताशाही की वजह से घाटे में चल रहे हैं। जहां तक विनिवेश का सवाल है एक संसदीय समिति ने सिफारिश की थी कि इसके तौर-तरीकों की जांच की जाए और मैं नहीं समझता हूं कि इसकी जांच हुई है। लेकिन मैं विनम्र निवेदन आपके माध्यम से करना चाहता हूं कि 23 जनवरी 1996 को हमने विनिवेश आयोग बनाया था, लेकिन वह आयोग खत्म कर दिया गया। विनिवेश के मामले में जब तक पारदर्शिता नहीं होगी तब तक उसका कोई मतलब नहीं है और इस सवाल पर सरकार की तरफ से कोई अंकुश नहीं है। नीतिगत निर्णयों में आला-अफसरों की बेतहाशा नियुक्ति के अलावा कुछ होता नहीं है। हमने कहा था कि विनिवेश के दो प्रमुख उद्देश्य हैं - सामाजिक क्षेत्र में स्वास्थ्य और शिक्षा पर ध्यान देना और देश के ऊपर जो सार्वजनिक ऋण का बोझ है उसको कम करना। सरकार कहे कुछ भी लेकिन सरकार पर भारी देशी और विदेशी जो कर्ज है और बजट के घाटे को पूरा करने के अलावा यह सरकार कुछ करने वाली नहीं है और विनिवेश के द्वारा यह इस काम को करना चाहती है। माननीय दासमुंशी जी कह रहे थे कि कल तक उनकी सरकार थी और अब ये आ गयेâ€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : कांग्रेस की वजह से ये आ गये हैं और कांग्रेस रहेगी तो â€¦ (व्यवधान) ये 180 भी नहीं रहेंगे। हम लोग मोर्चा वाले तो आयेंगे ही।â€¦(व्यवधान) 22 लोग आपके हमसे टिकट मांग रहे हैं लेकिन मैं दूंगा नहीं।

श्री रामजीलाल सुमन : सभापति जी, मुझे लगता है कि लालफीताशाही जानबूझकर भी किसी सरकारी उपक्रम को घाटे का बनाने के लिए वातावरण तैयार करती है।

भारतीय इस्पात प्राधिकरण की जो यूनिट्स हैं, उनका आधुनिकीकरण करने पर काफी पैसा लगाया गया लेकिन मुझे लगता है कि उसके शेयर भी बेचने वाले हैं। लाल फीताशाही जो काला-पीला कर देती है उसी पर सरकार मुहर लगाने का काम करती है। विनिवेश के मामले में जब तक पारदर्शिता नहीं होगी तब तक उसका कोई अर्थ नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूं कि सरकार विनिवेश के मामले में एक श्वेत पत्र जारी करे और पूरे देश और जनता को यह बताने का काम करे कि विनिवेश के मामले में सरकार की नीयत साफ है। कहीं न कहीं किसी दृष्टिकोण से देखने पर यह लगता है कि सरकार गोल-माल और घपलेबाजी कर रही है। जहां तक लक्ष्य की बात है मेरे पास आंकड़े हैं। लक्ष्य के मामले में इसकी गति शून्य के बराबर है। 1991-92 में 2500 करोड़ रुपए का लक्ष्य था और 3038 करोड़ रुपए मिले। 1992-93 में 2500 करोड़ रुपए का लक्ष्य था और 1913 करोड़ रुपए मिले। 1993-94 में 3500 करोड़ रुपए का लक्ष्य था लेकिन नहीं के बराबर मिले। 1994-

95 में 4000 करोड़ रुपए का लक्ष्य था लेकिन नहीं के बराबर मिले। इसी प्रकार 1995-96 में सात हजार करोड़ रुपए का लक्ष्य था लेकिन 362 करोड़ रुपए मिले। 1999-2000 में लक्ष्य 10 हजार करोड़ रुपए था लेकिन 1584 करोड़ रुपए मिले। लक्ष्य के मामले में ये कहीं सफल नहीं हो रहे हैं। लोक सभा के चुनावों के बाद संसद के संयुक्त अधिवेशन को राट्रपति जी ने संबोधित किया था। राट्रपति का वह अभिभाण सरकार का एक कमिटमैंट होता है। उसमें सरकार ने वायदा किया था कि सरकार एक करोड़ लोगों को प्रति वर्ा रोजगार देने का काम करेगी। सरकारी उपक्रमों में 22 लाख लोग काम करते थे लेकिन आज काम करने वालों की संख्या 19 लाख रह गई है। आपने लोगों को रोजगार न देकर उसे छीनने का काम किया। जब आप सरकारी उपक्रमों को बेचने का काम करेंगे तो यही हाल होगा। निजी क्षेत्र में आरक्षण नहीं है। एक तरफ आप आरक्षण को समाप्त करने का काम कर रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ बेरोजगारी बढ़ाने का काम कर रहे हैं। अभी छोड़ी देर पहले दासमुंशी जी भाण दे रहे थे। इससे पहले वेंकैया नायडु जी ग्रामीण विकास मंत्रालय की मांगों पर जवाब दे रहे थे। सरकार ने राट्रीय राजमार्गों को ठीक करने पर जोर दिया। जब तक गांवों में रौनक पैदा नहीं होगी माफ करना, शहरों की रौनक लम्बे समय तक देश में रह नहीं सकती। आप पूरा सैंटरलाइज कर रहे हैं लेकिन गांवों की निरन्तर उपेक्षा हो रही है। हमारे देश में कृाि की बुरी हालत है। किसी भी कोने से कृाि को संरक्षण देने का काम सरकार नहीं कर रही है। हिन्दुस्तान के 70-75 परसैंट लोग कृाि पर निर्भर करते हैं। सकल घरेलू उत्पाद में कृाि का योगदान आजादी के समय जितना था, उससे आधा रह गया है। 1971 से अब तक गेहूं का समर्थन मूल्य आठ गुना बढ़ा लेकिन उत्पादन लागत 15 गुना बढ़ गया। कृाि क्षेत्र को मजबूत करने और संरक्षण देने के लिए देश में कोई काम नहीं हो रहा है। 50 परसैंट गांव आज भी सड़कों से नहीं जुड़े हैं। गांव के तमाम बच्चे शिक्षा से इसलिए वंचित रह गए हैं कि उनके लिए पूरी व्यवस्था नहीं है। जब तक गांवों में स्कूल नहीं बनाएंगे, सड़कों को ठीक नहीं करेंगे, कृाि को संरक्षण नहीं देंगे, गांवों का विकास नहीं करेंगें। स्वास्थ्य सेवाओं का बुरा हाल है। आम आदमी अपना इलाज नहीं करवा सकता। अरुण शौरी जी, चाहे विनिवेश का सवाल हो या दूसरा कोई सवाल हो, हिन्दुस्तान का बहुसंख्यक वर्ग जहां रहता है अगर उसकी उपेक्षा करेंगे, किसानों की उपेक्षा करेंगे, मजदूरों की उपेक्षा करेंगे तो देश का भला होने वाला नहीं है। लिहाजा शुरुआत वहां से होनी चाहिए जहां सही मायने में कुछ करने की आवश्यकता है।

जहां तक विनिवेश का सवाल है, इससे आम आदमी का भला नहीं हो सकता, कृाि क्षेत्र का भला नहीं हो सकता, शिक्षा को मजबूत बनाने का काम नहीं हो सकता। विनिवेश के मामले में लीपा-पोती और घपलेबाजी के अलावा कुछ नहीं हो रहा है। सरकार की कोई नीति पारदर्शी नहीं है। यह सरकार कटघरे में खड़ी है। मैं चाहूंगा कि देश, दुनिया और सम्मानित सदन को विश्वास में लेने के लिए इस मामले में श्वेत पत्र जारी किया जाए क्योंकि इसके सिवाय दूसरा कोई रास्ता नहीं है। यदि आप आम आदमी को सही अर्थों में विश्वास में लेना चाहते हैं तो आपको यह करना होगा। यही मुझे निवेदन करना था।

श्री प्रकाश परांजपे (ठाणे) : चेयरमैन साहब, डिस्इनवैस्टमेंट पर चर्चा 1991 से शुरु है, तब से क्या हो गया। कौन सी सरकार ने गलत कदम उठाया और रूलिंग पार्टी कहती है कि कांग्रेस सरकार ने गलत कदम उठाया, so we are continuing with that.

On the contrary the common man is expecting something new from this Government. All the time repeating that Congress has done this and we are forced to continue with the policy, we do not agree. मुझे दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि employees on the Disinvestment Policy say, "बी.जे.पी. के खाने के दांत अलग हैं और दिखाने के दांत अलग हैं।"

In all the speeches the Ministers are saying that they would be protecting the interests of the workers. What interests are they protecting, I would like to know from them? They are giving VRS, asking the employees to go with 35 days" salary for completed years and 25 days" salary for balance years. Is that amount sufficient in cities to continue with that? Repeatedly we have been asking them to increase the VRS. But they are not responding to this demand of the workers. They are not looking into the matter and they are only saying that the workers interests would be protected.

My simple question is, to raise the funds, is it the only solution to privatise or to sell the shares? Can the hon. Minister not find some middle way to raise the funds? I had given a suggestion on this four months back. The entire public sector is going into losses because of mismanagement. Is the hon. Minister not going to enquire about as to why the public sector has gone into losses; who are the persons responsible for these losses? The employees are in no way connected with the losses, but the sufferers are the employees. The mismanagement, the unwarranted intervention of politics, and the interventions of bureaucracy have put these companies under losses and he is selling the companies. Who is the ultimate sufferer? The sufferer is only the worker and the example of this is again BALCO.

We had given a suggestion, why do they not think of having a private management, without selling the ownership of the Government. I have given an example of Mulund Company. Surprisingly, what reply do we get from the hon. Minister? It has been four months since I received the letter from the hon. Minister. The reply is, "we are getting the matter examined." चार महीने हो गये हैं, मैटर एग्जामिन कर रहे हैं लेकिन कुछ नहीं हो रहा है। The small scale industrial unit from Thane has offered its services that they were ready to take over the management, but do not sell the assets. They have asked them to take 25 per cent of the total assets as deposits, take lease rent for every year and said that if the mismanagement is not there and if the company earns a profit, they will get dividend on their shares. They have asked this thing only. But they want to raise the funds in one year by selling the companies. With my proposal, without selling the ownership, hiring the private management, efficient management and by taking the lease rent also, if the profits are there, they will get dividend. This is a slow process, but they do not want to do that.

SHRI M.V.V.S. MURTHI (VISAKHAPATNAM): If it goes into a loss!

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE : It will not go into loss because the persons who are taking it over have

calculated it that these companies can work properly and we can earn profit and that too when you are not required to sell the ownership of the company. Why are they not thinking about this?

The hon. Minister is repeatedly saying that he would be protecting the interests of the workers. For the last ten months, I have been fighting for a company, namely, Hindustan Organic Chemicals, that it should not be privatised. I am at least happy that the concerned Minister has written to me that he was getting the matter examined. But Shri Ram Naik, the hon. Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas, has suggested that his Department can take over the company. Reports are there, his Department has sanctioned Rs.30 lakh to evaluate assets of it. They need only a policy decision from you that HOC can be taken over by the concerned Petroleum Department.

Now, the Department has said that it is feasible because the raw material required for that company, that is *rasayan*, is being manufactured by that. Unfortunately, I have not received a simple line of reply on policy decision that "yes HOC can be taken over by BPCL". Same is the case with IPCL. The loss making unit at Baroda was given to a petroleum company of IOC. They are asking that entire unit of IPCL be taken over by IOC. He is not taking any action on that. He is only saying that 1991 में पॉलिसी बनाई, हम लोग चला रहे हैं।

17.00 hrs.

We cannot understand it. I would like to know whether raising the money is the issue of this Government, filling up the gap in the fiscal budget is the motto of this Government or looking after thousands and crores of workers is the motto of this Government.

I will be very much thankful to the Minister if he can give a decision that HOC and IPCL will not be privatised. The Shiv Sena *Pramukh* has also given a ring in this regard. The entire Shiv Sena has said that they are very much interested in not privatising this company. Due to mismanagement, this public sector has gone into losses. The hon. Minister can think about the middle proposal of hiring a management, whereby you need not lose the ownership.

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : सभापति महोदयâ€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री रघुनाथ झा : क्या गला फंस गया है ? इतना हल्ला किया था।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : बिहार का गला कट गया।

सभापति महोदय : आप टोका-टोकी मत करिये, माननीय सदस्य का गला फंसा हुआ है।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : सभापति महोदय, होशियार लोग जनता को ठगने के लिए देश के बेचने के काम को डिसइनवैस्टमैंट कह रहे हैं। असल में बेच रहे हैं देश और नाम है डिसइनवैस्टमैंट। हम लोग कहेंगे कि डिसइनवैस्टमैंट क्या है तो कहेंगे विनिवेश। श्री परांजपे जी नहीं हैं, हम तो खिलाफ पार्टी के हैं, इसलिए बराबर इनके खिलाफ हैं। जिद कर रहे हं कि आप देश मत बेचिये, लेकिन यह जिद पर अड़े हुए है। इन्हें बुझाता है कि देश बेचने से बड़ा फायदा होने वाला है, इसलिए लगे हुए हैं, चार-पांच बार बहस हुई है, हम लोगों ने कितना विरोध किया, लेकिन यह मानने वाले नहीं है।â€¦(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : रामदास जी, आप अपनी सीट पर बैठिये, यह फेयर नहीं है, आप अपना आसन ग्रहण कीजिए।â€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री रामदास आठवले : बाल्को से आपको कितना फायदा हुआ है और देश को बेचने के बाद आपको फायदा होने वाला है।â€¦(व्यवधान)

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : सभापति महोदय यह कहा जायेगा कि हम विरोधी हैं, इसलिए इनका विरोध कर रहे हैं। लेकिन वे तो सपोर्टर हैं, वे भी कह रहे हैं कि देश बेच रहे हैं, क्या गलत कर रहे हैं।

सभापति महोदय, एक दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी हैं, विचारक हैं, पुराने नेता है, स्वदेशी जागरण मंच के, भारतीय मजदूर सभा के संस्थापक हैं। हमारी पार्टी के नहीं हैं, वह उनकी पार्टी के हैं, आर.एस.एस. के हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि इस देश का अर्थ मंत्री अनर्थ मंत्री है, अपराधी है। हम कहेंगे तो सब लोग खड़े हो जायेंगे। â€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : आप ऐसा मत कहिये, फंस मत जाना, यह चतुराई है कि विपक्ष की राजनीति भी करेंगे और सरकार भी चलायेंगे। यह चालाकी है, अपने लोगों से आलोचना करवायेंगे, जिससे हम लोग न कर पायें। यह ाड्यंत्र है, इसमें फंस मत जाना।â€¦(व्यवधान)

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : श्री ठेंगड़ी ने कहा कि देश बेच रहे हैं। यह उन्हीं के लोग कह रहे हैं। हम तो विरोधी हैं, हम तो कह ही रहे हैं , लेकिन यह मान नहीं रहे हैं, जिद पर अड़े हुए हैं। आप डिसइनवैस्टमैंट का जवाब दीजिए। सवाल नम्बर (1) आपने डिसइनवैस्टमैंट कमीशन को क्यों खत्म किया ? (2) डिसइनवैस्टमैंट कमीशन की रिपोर्ट की आप अवहेलना क्यों कर रहे हैं ? (3) कमीशन् ने कहा है कि डिसइन वैस्टमैंट प्राइवेटाइजेशन एक नहीं हैं, लेकिन यह प्राइवेटाइजेशन कर रहे हैं और उत्साहपूर्वक कहते हैं कि डिसइनवैस्टमैंट मायने प्राइ वेटाइजेशन - क्या इनका फार्मूला यही है और प्रैक्टीकल भी यही कर रहे हैं। (4)श्री रामजीलाल सुमन चले गये हैं, पार्टी के हिसाब से जवाब दें,मंत्री जी बोलेंगे तो उधर से मेजें थपथपा देंगे, मैं एक सवाल पूछता हूं कि अगर प्राइवेटाइजेशन होगा या डिसइनवैस्टमैंट होगा तो आरक्षण का क्या होगा। दलित और पिछड़ी जातियों को सरकारी संस्थानों में आरक्षण मिला हुआ है, जब आप प्राइवेटाइजेशन करेंगे तो उस आरक्षण का क्या होगा, आप इसका स्पट जवाब दीजिए। पार्टीबंदी के हिसाब से सब लोग मेजें थपथपा देंगे।

इन सबका मंत्री जी स्पैसिफिक जवाब दें। लोग कहते हैं ट्रांसपेरेन्सी, ट्रांसपेरेन्सी - यह ठीक बात है कि भ्रटाचार के खिलाफ अव्वल चीज ट्रांसपेरेन्सी है। ये कहते हैं कि हमने सीएजी को भेज दिया और हो गई ट्रांसपेरेन्सी। यह ट्रांसपेरेन्सी नहीं, लोगों को अंधकार में डालने वाली परिभाा है। ट्रांसपेरेन्सी मतलब पारदर्शिता जो देखने से पता चले लेकिन देखने से प्राइमा फेसी पता चलता है बाल्को अथवा मॉडर्न फूड इंडस्ट्रीज़ में आम जनता में क्या बातें हैं उधर के ही माननीय सदस्य बताएंगे कि ज्यादा दाम की चीज को कम दाम में ले देकर बेच दिया यह बात आम लोगों में है। कहां पारदर्शिता है, कहां ट्रांसपेरेन्सी है? हर जगह गर्म अफवाह है, कहीं होगा सौ दो सौ करोड़ पूंजीपतियों से लिया, इतना माल खा लिया पूंजीपतियों से कि सरकारी संपत्तियों को भी बेच देंगे। ट्रांसपेरेन्सी कहां है क्यों नहीं बताते? इस पर श्वेत-पत्र की मांग हो रही है। बताइए उस संपत्ति की क्या कीमत थी और आपने कितने में उसको बेचा? कोर्ट-कचहरी या जांच की बात नहीं करते और जेपीसी का नाम सुनते ही लोग भाग जाते हैं। सांच को आंच क्या, जांच करा लें। आप दावा करते हैं कि आप ठीक काम कर रहे हैं, आप बहुत दुरुस्त हैं तो क्यों जांच से भागते हैं? *

सभापति महोदय : आप कनक्लूड कीजिए। आप अपनी बात कहिए।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : अपनी ही बात कह रहा हूं। â€¦(व्यवधान)

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

सभापति महोदय : पप्पू यादव जी, आप बीच में टोका-टाकी न करें। माननीय सदस्य अपनी बात कहने में सक्षम हैं। उनको सहायता की जरूरत नहीं है।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : हमारा राट्रीय झंडा तिरंगा एयर इंडिया के हवाई जहाज पर पूरी दुनिया में घूमता है। *अब सुनते हैं कि एयर इंडिया का प्राइवेटाइजेशन होगा और ये उसका भी हिसाब जोड़ रहे हैं, गोटी बैठा रहे हैं और कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि उसको भी बेचा जाए। â€¦(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : जो अशोभनीय शब्द हैं, वे प्रोसीडिंग्ज़ का पार्ट नहीं बनेंगे।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : क्या किया दो लाख चालीस करोड़ रुपये का? ठीक कहा परांजपे साहब ने कि वीआरएस कर रहे हैं, छंटनी कर रहे हैं और कहते हैं कि नेशनल ऐजेन्डा है? उसमें था कि बेरोजगारी दूर करेंगे और आप यह कर रहे हैं? â€¦(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : रघुवंश जी, आप अपनी बात समाप्त करें।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : इन्होंने देश के साथ छल किया है, धोखा किया है। इन्होंने कहा कि हम बेरोज़गारी खत्म करेंगे लेकिन जिनको रोज़गार मिला है, उनको भी ये बेरोज़गार बना रहे हैं। नए रोज़गार देने की क्षमता और सामर्थ्य इनमें नहीं है, कोई नीति और कार्यक्रम नहीं है। इसलिए देश के साथ छल मत करिए और डिसइनवैस्टमेंट के नाम पर देश को मत बेचिए। जनता आपको माफ नहीं करेगी और आपको सबक देगी। हम जनता का भी आह्वान करते हैं कि इस सरकार से सावधान हो जाए और देश को किसी भी हालत में बेचना जनता बर्दाश्त नहीं करेगी। â€¦(व्यवधान)

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

सभापति महोदय : पप्पू जी, यह जीरो अवर नहीं है, महत्वपूर्ण विाय पर चर्चा हो रही है। आपको चेयर से बोलने की अनुमति नहीं है, आपकी कोई बात रिकार्ड पर नहीं जाएगी।

...(व्यवधान) *

सभापति महोदय : श्री ब्रह्मानन्द मंडल।

...(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : श्री ब्रह्मानन्द मंडल के अलावा कोई बात प्रोसीडिंग्ज़ में रेकार्ड नहीं की जाएगी।

...(व्यवधान) ।

सभापति महोदय : हम खड़े हैं तो आप बैठ जाइए। सदन में व्यवधान मत करिए मैं बार-बार आपसे कह रहा हूं।

श्री ब्रह्मानन्द मंडल।

* Not Recorded

श्री ब्रह्मानन्द मंडल (मुंगेर) : माननीय सभापति जी, हम लोग सदन में विनिवेश की नीति पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं। जब कांग्रेस का राज था, तब

1991 में नई आर्थिक नीति बनाई गई। उसी का एक हिस्सा यह विनिवेश की नीति है। â€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री राजेश रंजन उर्फ पप्पू यादव : सभापति महोदय, बिहार मेंâ€¦(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : पप्पू जी, आप बैठिए। यह ठीक नहीं है कि जब मन में आए आप बिना चेयर की अनुमति के बोलने के लिए खड़े हो जाते हैं। यह सदन की स्वस्थ परम्परा नहीं है। कृपया आप ऐसी परम्परा कायम न करें। मैं चेयर से आपका नाम बार-बार नहीं लेना चाहता हूं। यह ठीक नहीं है। कृपया आप बैठ जाएं।

श्री ब्रह्मानन्द मंडल : इसमें दो राय नहीं हैं कि सत्ता पक्ष हो या विपक्ष, सभी इस नीति का समर्थन कर रहे हैं, लेकिन जो इसकी वार्षिक रिपोर्ट है और जो भाण यहां हुए हैं उनको सुनकर हमारी चिन्ता बढ़नी स्वाभाविक है क्योंकि विनिवेश का अर्थ निजीकरण लगाया गया है।

सभापति महोदय, विनिवेश हो, वैश्वीकरण हो या भूमंडलीकरण हो, ये सारे शब्द एक ही स्थान पर केन्द्रित हो जाते हैं और वह शब्द है निजीकरण। हमारे देश के अंदर सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की स्थापना आजादी के बाद हुई। इसकी चर्चा भी इसमें है और अब उसकी आवश्यकता हमें क्यों नहीं है और क्यों हम उनके शेयरों को बेच रहे हैं इसका भी जिक्र इस रिपोर्ट में दिया गया है और इस विनिवेश का क्या उद्देश्य है, उसके ऊपर भी इसमें प्रकाश डाला गया है। इस सबको देखकर हमारे यहां जो सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र हैं उनको तीन भागों में बांटा गया प्रतीत होता है। एक तो वे जो घाटे में चल रहे हैं, दूसरे वे जिनमें कुप्रबन्ध है और तीसरे वे जो मुनाफे में चल रहे हैं। इन तीनों श्रेणियों के उद्योगों के लिए अलग-अलग नीतियां होनी चाहिए या नहीं, यह मेरी और मेरी पार्टी की परेशानी का कारण है।

सभापति महोदय, विनिवेश की नीति में कहा गया है कि जो उद्योग घाटे में चल रहे हैं या जिनमें कुप्रबन्ध है, उन्हें बन्द किया जा सकता है। जो सार्वजनिक उद्योग मुनाफे में चल रहे हैं और जिनमें घाटा नहीं है, हम उन्हीं को बेचेंगे। 1993 में रंगराजन समिति बनी थी। उस समिति ने जो रिपोर्ट दी है उसके आधार पर कहा गया कि 74 फीसदी शेयर हम निजी क्षेत्रों को दे सकते हैं और मात्र 26 प्रतिशत सा र्वजनिक क्षेत्र का हिस्सा रहेगा और अन्त में कहा गया है कि सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र का हिस्सा उससे भी कम किया जा सकता है।

मेरी चिन्ता यह है कि बालको पर यहां बहुत बहस हुई है और जो अखबारों में आ रहा है, मैं इस बात को जानना भी चाहता हूं कि बालको की जो सम्पत्ति है, वह कितनी है। अखबारों में जो बात आ रही है उसके हिसाब से बालको 270 मैगावाट बिजली उत्पादन की परियोजना है। आज से 10 साल पहले योजना आयोग ने एक मैगावाट बिजली पैदा करने में चार करोड़ रुपए खर्च होने की बात कही थी।

270 मैगावाट बिजली का जो प्रोजैक्ट है, उसका ही एक हजार 80 करोड़ रुपये हो जाता है। अखबारों में जो बातें हमें देखने को मिली है, उससे पता चलता है कि बाल्को कम्पनी के फिक्स डिपाजिट में 360 करोड रुपये हैं। ये रुपये हैं या नहीं या अखबार वाले कहीं गलत तो नहीं लिख रहे, इसको भी देखना चाहिए? इसकी जमीन की कीमत क्या है ? जो एल्युमिनियम फैक्टरी है, अगर उसको कबाड़ी के दाम में बेचें तो उसकी क्या कीमत होगी ? इसके बावजूद भी यह कहा जाता है कि ये कम्पनियां मुनाफे में हैं। इसके 51 फीसदी शेयर बेचकर हमने 551 करोड़ रुपये पाये हैं। मैं इसके उद्देश्य को पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूं। इसमें कहा गया है कि गैर महत्वपूर्ण सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के उद्यमों में लगे सार्वजनिक संसाधनों की बढ़ी धनराशि को उन् क्षेत्रों में लगाने के लिए, अवमुक्त करने के लिए, जो समाज की प्राथमिकता में सर्वोपरि है जैसे सार्वजनिक स्वास्थ्य, परिवार कल्याण, प्राथमिक शिक्षा तथा सामाजिक और आवश्यक आधार-भूत सरंचना। इसी में कहा गया है कि जो धन सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में लगा हुआ है, उद्यमों में लगा धन वास्तव में जन-साधारण का पैसा है। इसलिए इस पैसे को जन-साधारण में लगाना चाहिए। इसलिए विनिवेश होना चाहिए। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि पांच हजार करोड़ रुपये हिन्दुस्तान की जनता का पैसा अगर बाल्को में लगा हुआ है और उसके 51 फीसदी शेयर बेचते हैं. उस पैसे को निकालना चाहते हैं तो उससे एक हजार करोड़ रुपये भी आने चाहिए। अगर यह पैसा नहीं आता है और यह कम्पनी मुनाफे में चल रही है तो आप उसका विनिवेश क्यों करेंगे ? जो उद्योग मुनाफे में चल रहे हैं, वह मुनाफा हिन्दुस्तान के खजाने में जाता है या दूसरी जगह चला जाता है वह पैसा जन-कल्याण में लगाते हैं या नहीं ? तब भी आप मुनाफे वाली कम्पनियों को निजी हाथों में दे रहे हैं। इतनी बड़ी पूंजी आप देते चले जा रहे हैं। अगर यह हुआ है तो हम जानना चाहते हैं कि क्या विनिवेश, निजीकरण, उदारीकरण, वैश्वीकरण सब एक ही चीज हैं ? इसकी भी जानकारी हमें होनी चाहिए। हमारी इस पर सहमति है कि जब कांग्रेस भी तैयार है और कांग्रेस ने भी इस नीति को चलाया है, हम भी चला रहे हैं लेकिन सारी नीतियों के ऊपर राष्ट्रीय हित है। जिस जनता की हम बात करते हैं, जिसके कल्याण की बात करते हैं, जिस पर खर्च करने की बात करते हैं और जिसके बारे में कहते हैं कि यह धन उसी का है तो क्यों यह धन दूसरे के पास जा रहा है। पांच हजार करोड़ रुपये की सम्पति 551 करोड़ रुपये में आप दे दीजिएगा और कहियेगा कि जनता की सम्पत्ति है, हम उसको निकाल रहे हैं और यही विनिवेश है, यह हमारी समझ के परे है। यह चिन्ता की बात है।

सभापति महोदय : अब आप समाप्त करिये।

श्री रघुनाथ झा : सभापति जी, यह अच्छा बोल रहे हैं इसलिए आप इनको बोलने दीजिए।

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव : मैं इन्हें कन्कलूड करने के लिए कह रहा हूं क्योंकि यह कोई नया प्वाइंट नहीं बोल रहे हैं।

श्री ब्रह्मानन्द मंडल : सभापति जी, मैं अभी एक ही प्वाइंट पर बोला हूं। मैं ज्यादा समय न लेकर सिर्फ एक-दो प्वाइंट पर ही बोलूंगा । मैं नई बात ही कहूंगा, पुरानी बात को नहीं दोहराऊंगा। मेरा आपके माध्यम से सरकार से निवेदन है कि इस पर वे जरा सोचें।

सार्वजनिक उद्योग सिर्फ मुनाफे के लिए नहीं बनाए गए थे। यह वास्तविकता है कि आजादी के बाद जो सार्वजनिक उद्योग बनाए गए थे, उन्हें देश को अपने पैरों पर खड़ा करने के लिए बनाया गया था। यह भी सही है कि हमारे देश के जो बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपति अभी हैं, 1948 में वे इस लायक नहीं थे। मैं बोकारो की बात कहता हूं। उस समय उस पर 2200 करोड़ रुपये खर्च हुए थे। हिन्दुस्तान और दुनिया का कोई भी पूंजीपति बोकारो स्टील प्लांट देने के लिए तैयार नहीं था क्योंकि टाटा, बिरला की 500-600 करोड़ रुपये की सम्पत्ति थी, वे 2200 करोड़ रुपये कहां से लगाते। आज बोकारो की कितनी कीमत है, आप मार्किट रेट देखेंगे या नहीं। हम गांव में देखते हैं कि अगर पच्चीस साल पहले दस कट्ठा जमीन किसी को बेचनी होती थी कि इसका ज्यादा दाम मिल रहा है, लेकिन हमारे देश के जो बड़े उद्योग हैं, आज उनका उतना दाम भी नहीं आ रहा है, उससे आधा दाम भी नहीं आ रहा है जितना उसका मूल्य है। इस पर विचार आपको करना चाहिए।â€¦(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : दूसरा नया बिन्दू क्या है?

श्री ब्रह्मानन्द मंडल : दूसरी बात मैं कुप्रबंधन के संबंध में कहना चाहता हूं जिस पर हमने कभी विचार नहीं किया, अब करना चाहिए। जो स्थिति सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में पहुंची है,, अब वक्त गुजर चुका है, यह होगा या नहीं, मै नहीं कह सकता लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि ट्रेड यूनियनों की भूमिका अच्छी नहीं रही है। ट्रेड यूनियन चलाने वाले बुरा न मानें। आज मजदूरों के सिर्फ अधिकारों की बात की जाती है, आन्दोलन, कर्तव्य की बात नहीं की जाती कि हमारे देश का उद्योग हमारा और आपका है, इसलिए उसमें ज्यादा उत्पादन होना चाहिए, ज्यादा मुनाफा होना चाहिए, ज्यादा मेहनत करनी चाहिए, यह हमारा कर्तव्य है। चाहे जिस भी राजनैतिक दल से सम्बद्ध ट्रेड यूनियन हो, उन्होंने यह काम नहीं किया। इसकी वजह से भी यह स्थिति आई है। यदि हमने बचे-खुचे उद्योगों पर ध्यान नहीं दिया तो उसमें भी यही स्थिति आएगी। ...(व्यवधान)

मैं समाप्त कर रहा हूं। इसलिए ट्रेड यूनियन चलाने वाले जो हम लोग हैं, उनको भी विचार करना चाहिए कि इसे कैसे चलाना चाहिए। विश्व की जो नई परिस्थिति है और जो हवा बह रही है, उसी हवा में हमें सांस लेना भी है और छोड़ना भी है। एक माफिया के तहत, खासकर सार्वजनिक क्षेत्रों में, ट्रेड यूनियन को चलाया जा रहा है। यही वजह है कि आज वह आर्थिक ढांचा, जिसने देश को आत्मनिर्भर बनाया था, उसे कौड़ियों के दाम बेच रहे हैं।

अंतिम बात कहना चाहता हूं कि यहां कुछ संवैधानिक बातें जो उठाई गई हैं, वे यह हैं कि इन उद्योगों में काम करने वाले मजदूरों के आरक्षण का सवाल रहेगा या नहीं। सारे उद्योग जब निजी हाथों में चले जाएंगे तो शैडयूल्ड कास्ट्स, शैडयूल्ड ट्राइब्स या बैकवर्ड क्लासेस का आरक्षण रहेगा या नहीं, इस पर आपने कभी विचार किया है या नहीं और अभी भी करना चाहते हैं या नहीं। मजदूरों का हित किस रूप में सुरक्षित रहेगा। हालांकि वार्षिक रिपोर्ट में आपने चर्चा जरूर की है लेकिन किस रूप में उनके हितों की सुरक्षा की गारंटी करेंगे, यह बात इसमें नहीं है। इसमें आपने लिखा है कि उनके हित सुरक्षित रहेंगे। यह मेरी चिन्ता है। मैं खासकर कहना चाहता हूं कि जो सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र मुनाफे में हैं, सरकार को विनिवेश, जो पूंजी निकाल कर उसी जनता की सेवा में लगाना चाहते हैं, उद्देश्य तो आपका यही है, कहीं ऐसा न हो कि उल्टा हो जाए।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

श्री रामजीवन सिंह (बलिया, बिहार) : सभापति महोदय, विनिवेश की मांग पर चर्चा चल रही है। मैं बड़े गौर से माननीय सदस्य दासमुंशी साहब को सुन रहा था। वे अच्छे वक्ता हैं, वकालत का अच्छा तर्क जानते हैं। गलत केस में भी अच्छी वकालत करते हैं। रोंग हॉर्स को भी अच्छे ढंग से ड्राइव करते हैं। वे सम्मानित व्यक्ति हैं, मैं उनका सम्मान करता हूं। जब वे चर्चा कर रहे थे तो मुझे लगा कि निश्चित तौर पर वे विनिवेश की नीति पर कुछ चर्चा करेंगे, लेकिन जब मैंने उनको सुना तो वही सारी बातें कहीं, जो पिछले दिनों बालको प्रकरण पर हुई चर्चा के समय कही थी, उन्होंने ही चर्चा उठाई है। उनके वही तर्क थे, वही राग, वही सारी चीजें थीं। हां, एक बात उन्होंने अवश्य कही कि विनिवेश का, डिसइन्वेस्टमेंट का अर्थ निजीकरण लगाया गया है। मैं मानता हूं, उन्होंने कहा कि इसका अर्थ निजीकरण नहीं लगाना चाहिए। मैं मानता हूं कि इसका मतलब सीधे निजीकरण नहीं होता है, लेकिन यह बात सही है कि विनिवेश का कदम जिस तरफ जाता है, वह सीधे निजीकरण की तरफ जाता है, इसमें दो राय नहीं हैं। यह क्यों शुरू हुआ, कई माननीय सदस्यों ने इस बात की चर्चा की है, मैं उसको दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूं कि कौन इसके लिए जिम्मेदार हैं, लेकिन आखिर यह परिस्थिति पैदा हुई। जिस समय इस देश के आर्थिक विकास की संरचना की जा रही थी, स्वर्गीय पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी प्रधानमंत्री थे। उनके प्रति मैं आभार प्रकट करता हूं, सिर झुकाता हूं। इस देश में जो मिश्रित अर्थव्यवस्था की अवधारणा उन्होंने की थी कि प्राइवेट और पब्लिक सैक्टर दोनों होंगे। मंडल जी कह रहे थे कि पब्लिक सैक्टर मुनाफे के लिए नहीं है, उनका यह निश्चित तौर पर उद्देश्य नहीं था, लेकिन एक उद्देश्य यह था कि पब्लिक सैक्टर और प्राइवेट सैक्टर दोनों के बीच में प्रतिस्पर्धा होगी, दोनों एक दूसरे से आगे बढ़ने का प्रयास करेंगे और इसके लिए दोनों अपनी गुणवत्ता को, अपनी दक्षता को बढ़ाने का काम करेंगे और उसकी गुणवत्ता को कायम रखकर उसकी कीमत भी कम करेंगे, जिससे विश्व बाजार में अपना स्थान बना सकें और इस देश में आर्थिक विकास के लिए जो एक आधारशिला खड़ी की जायेगी, उसकी संरचना का निर्माण करेंगे। लेकिन यह परिस्थिति क्यों पैदा हुई। जवाहर लाल जी के मरने के बाद मैं उन माननीय सदस्य से सहमत हूं कि पब्लिक सैक्टर में कुप्रबन्धन हुआ। उसके चेयरमैन की नियुक्ति में, उसके सी.एम.डी., उसके जी.एम. के पदस्थापन में इतना हस्तक्षेप हुआ कि वहां कुप्रबन्धन हुआ। इतना ही नहीं, जिनके हाथ में उसका प्रबन्धन सौंपा गया,उन्होने क्या किया स्वर्गीय सरदार पटेल ने 600 से ज्यादा नेटिव स्टेट्स को समाप्त किया था, लेकिन सारे पब्लिक सैक्टर के जो प्रबन्धक थे, उन्होंने अपने को नेटिव स्टेट के नरेश की तरह बिहेव किया और उसी तरह से उसका उपयोग किया। इस तरह से उसका संचालन किया जिससे लगा कि वे देसी रियासत के नरेश हैं और उसका परिणाम यह निकला कि आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता वे बन्द होते चले गये। 1951 में मात्र पांच यूनिट्स थे,

पब्लिक सैक्टर के और उस पर 29 करोड़ रुपये लगे थे और मार्च, 1999 में आकर 240 यूनिट्स हुए और उसमें 2.30 लाख करोड़ से ज्यादा रुपये लगाये गये थे,वे ब्लाक हो गये। अभी कुछ दिन पहले रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया की एक रिपोर्ट आई कि 1999 के मार्च तक जितनी एस.एस.आई. की यूनिट्स थीं, उनमें 3.19 लाख यूनिट्स सिक थीं, रोगग्रस्त या कमजोर थीं और उनके ऊपर बैंकों का 19 हजार करोड़ रुपये से ज्यादा रुपया उनमें जाकर ब्लाक हो गया था। इनको सुधारने का प्रयास होना चाहिए था, लेकिन यह बात निश्चित तौर पर है कि इसे सुधारने का प्रयास नहीं किया गया, बल्कि नीति में ही परिवर्तन करने का प्रयास किया गया। एक गलत चीज होती है इस देश में, हम लोग देख रहे हैं कि जब किसी पद्धति से उसका सही रिजल्ट नहीं आता है तो यह होता है कि पद्धति को ही बदल दो, नीति को ही बदल दो। उसमें जो खामियां हैं, उसमें जो त्रुटियां हैं, उनको सुधारने का प्रयास होना चाहिए था, वह नहीं हुआ और परिणाम यह निकला कि जवाहर लाल जी ने जो सपना देखा था और कहा था कि यह भिलाई, दुर्गापुर, राऊरकेला, बोकारो आधुनिक भारत में निर्माण के मंदिर बनेंगे, वे सभी निर्माण के मंदिर नहीं बन सके, उसका यह विपरीत परिणाम सामने आया।

इसीलिए कांग्रेस ने 1991 में विनिवेश की नीति चलाई। मैं समझता हूं वहीं पर गलत काम हुआ था। आज विज्ञान ने दुनिया की दूरी को इतना छोटा कर दिया है कि विश्व में अगर कहीं छोटी या बड़ी घटना घटती है तो उसका तुरंत विश्वव्यापी असर पड़ता है। एक प्रयोग हुआ था निजीकरण का कभी, उसकी विफलता के बाद मार्क्स ने जो कल्पना की थी, फिर उसकी जगह राट्रीयकरण आया। उसका भी हमने दुपरिणाम देखा है। निजीकरण का भी देख चुके हैं, जिसने मार्क्ससिज्म को पैदा किया। उसके बाद जब राट्रीयकरण आया रशिया के अंदर तो 74 वर्ा के बाद उनका झंडा भी झुक गया। हमारी पार्टी, सोशलिस्ट पार्टी उस समय बहुत छोटी थी। उस समय हमारी पार्टी ने जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी से कहा था कि आपके इस राट्रीयकरण से देश का कभी विकास नहीं होगा इसलिए इसका समाजीकरण करो, जो गांधी जी की ट्रस्टीशिप से लिया गया था। लेकिन उस समय हमारी पार्टी के पास इतनी ताकत नहीं थी इसलिए हम दबाव नहीं डाल सके। आज जब रूस में यह हालत होती है, तो फिर निजीकरण की तरफ जाया जा रहा है, मैं यह कहूंगा कि गलत दिशा की तरफ वह देश जा रहा है।

आज अमेरिका में मंदी चल रही है। जापान में कल चुनाव हुआ है। वहां की जनता ने सरकार को बदल दिया, क्योंकि जापान में भयानक ढंग से मंदी चल रही है और नए शासन से लोग अपेक्षा कर रहे हैं कि वे इससे देश को निजात दिलाएंगे। इसलिए भारत जैसे देश में इस

दिशा की तरफ जाकर हम भारत का नव-निर्माण नहीं कर सकते, गांधी जी और नेहरू जी के सपनों को साकार नहीं कर सकते। इसीलिए जो विनिवेश की नीति चलाई गई है, वह सही नहीं है। मैं आपकी मजबूरी समझता हूं। कोलीशन सरकार की मजबूरी होती है। वह कभी रिवोल्युशन नहीं कर सकती, वह करेगी तो सिर्फ रिलीफ का काम ही कर सकती है। लेकिन इस दिशा की तरफ हमें जरूर ध्यान देना चाहिए।

दासमुंशी जी ने और अन्य लोगों ने कहा कि जो कम्पनीज मुनाफे में हैं, उनका निजीकरण मत करो। एक बहुत पुरानी कहावत है कि मरा हुआ बैल कोई नहीं खरीदता। उसी बैल को खरीदा जाता है जिसमें ताकत हो खेत जोतने की और गाड़ी खींचने की। इसी तरह मरी हुई यूनिट्स में कोई सम्पत्ति नहीं लगाना चाहेगा। मैं निजीकरण की वकालत नहीं कर रहा हूं। जिस देश में संसदीय लोकतंत्र होता है, वहां पार्टियों के फंडामेंटल्स में अंतर नहीं होता। अंतर होते हैं प्राथमिकताओं में। इस देश के तमाम राजनैतिक दलों को बैठकर भारत की जनसंख्या को देखते हुए एक निश्चित अर्थव्यवस्था बनानी चाहिए। भारत के सामने जो समस्याएं हैं, उनको देखते हुए, भारत में जो उपलब्ध संसाधन हैं, उनको देखते हुए एक दिशा निर्धारित करनी चाहिए। दुनिया ने कभी निजीकरण को नकार दिया था, फिर उसी दिशा की तरफ जाकर हम देश का निर्माण नहीं कर सकते, इसलिए इस गम्भीरता से सोचना चाहिए। जो गांधी जी ने, जयप्रकाश जी ने और लोहिया जी ने कहा था समाजीकरण के बारे में, उस तरफ देश को ले जाकर हम इसका निदान कर सकते हैं। विनिवेश से कभी भी हमारी आर्थिक व्यवस्था का निदान नहीं हो सकता। मैं आपकी मांग का समर्थन करता हूं, लेकिन जो त्रुटियां हैं, जिसका जिक्र अभी किया गया है कि हमारे देश में वर्क कल्चर खराब हो रहा है, उसको सुधारने का प्रयास किया जाना चाहिए। थोड़ा सा प्रयास किया गया था। कारखानों में हड़तालें होती हैं, तालाबंदी होती है, जिसके चलते उनके उत्पादन पर असर पड़ता है और वे घाटे में चले जाते हैं। 1999 में प्रयास किया गया कि मजदूरों के वेजेज का सवाल हो, उनके रिट्रेंचमेंट का सवाल हो, चाहे प्रमोशन का सवाल हो, जब से सरकार ने दृढ़ता के साथ और तत्परता के साथ उसको सुलझाने का प्रयास किया तो सार्थक नतीजे भी निकले। जहां 1998 में 665 हड़तालें हुईं, वहीं 1999 में 448 हुईं। इसी तरह जहां 1998 में करीब 432 तालाबंदी हुईं, वहीं 1999 में 387 हुईं। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि सरकार अपनी कमजोरी को देखे चाहे जो भी सरकार हो।

1977 के बाद इस देश में एक राजनीतिक परिवर्तन हुआ। इस देश में जितने भी मान्यता प्राप्त राजनैतिक दल हैं, सभी सत्ता पक्ष में भी हैं और विपक्ष में भी हैं। यहां 22 दलों की सरकार सत्ता में है और जो विरोध में हैं, वे कई राज्यों में सत्ता पक्ष में हैं तथा जो यहां सत्ता पक्ष में हैं, वे कई राज्यों में विपक्ष में हैं। इसलिए सभी मान्यता प्राप्त राजनैतिक दल कहीं न कहीं सत्ता पक्ष और विपक्ष की भूमिका निभा रहे हैं।

लेकिन परिणाम यह होता है कि जो सत्तापक्ष में हैं, उनकी बोली, उनका आचरण कुछ और है और प्रतिपक्ष का कुछ और होता है, ऐसा करना एक आचरण ही बन गया है। इसीलिए नीतियों पर आधारित चर्चा न होकर हमेशा नीयत पर चर्चा हो जाती है, व्यक्ति पर हो जाती है। इसीलिए मैं बार-बार सभी राजनीतिक दलों से कहता हूं कि लोकतंत्र अब खतरे में पड़ गया है उसको देखें। अगर हम बुनियादी सवालों को हल नहीं करेंगे तो याद रखें लोकतंत्र मिट जायेगा और मैं इस देश की जनता के माध्यम से अनुरोध करना चाहता हूं कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां नहीं है कि यह तेरहवा लोक सभा चुनाव नीतियों पर नहीं हुआ था, व्यक्तियों पर हुआ था। अटल बनाम सोनिया और सोनिया बनाम अटल हुआ था। अटल जी प्रधान मंत्री होंगे कि श्रीमती सोनिया गांधी जी प्रधान मंत्री होंगी। और, तब इस देश की तमाम पोलिटिकल पार्टीज दो खेमों में बंट गई थीं। अटल जी के ऊपर विश्वास किया गया और अटल जी के हाथ में आज शासन है तो मैं एनडीए सरकार से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि इस देश में कुछ बुनियादी परिवर्तन करें, कुछ बुनियादी नीतियों में सुधार करें नहीं तो दीवार पर लिखी रेखाओं को पढ़े। 1967 की विफलता ने नक्सलवाद को पैदा किया, 1977 की विफलता ने उग्रवाद को पैदा किया और अब जो विफलता होगी, उससे इस देश में उग्रवाद बढ़ेगा। जब उग्रवाद बढ़ता है तो लोक तंत्र की जड़ें कमजोर हो जाती हैं। और, लोकतंत्र की जब जड़ें कमजोर हो जाएंगी तो फिर क्या हश्र होगा, यह आप सभी देख लेंगे। इसीलिए मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि नीतियों के निर्धारण में जो लकीर कांग्रेस के द्वारा बनाई गई है, उस पर अब चलने की जरुरत नहीं है। मैं उनसे भी अनुरोध करूंगा कि गलत रास्ते पर जाने से लौट जाना ज्यादा अच्छा होता है। इसीलिए दुनिया की अर्थ-व्यवस्था को देखते हुए, दुनिया की विफलताओं को भी देखते हुए इस देश को एक नयी दिशा की तरफ ले चलें जिससे इस देश का नव-निर्माण हो सके। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं आपकी इस मांग का समर्थन करते हुए अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

श्री राम सजीवन (बांदा) : सभापति महोदय, विनिवेश प्रक्रिया पर हमारी पार्टी की राय है कि हम इसके खिलाफ नहीं हैं लेकिन यह जो पब्लिक सैक्टर बनाये गये थे, इनका मुख्य लक्ष्य यह था कि देश को अपने पैरों पर खड़ा किया जाये, आर्थिक व्यवस्था मजबूत की जाये और देश का विकास साथ-साथ हो जाये। उस समय एक बड़ा भारी आंदोलन चला था और हम लोग तो उस आंदोलन में शामिल रहते थे, आप भी उसमें शामिल रहते थे और इधर जो बहुत से मिनिस्टर बैठे हैं, वे भी उसमें शामिल रहते थे और हम लोग यह मान लिया करते थे कि बीमा कंपनियों का राट्रीयकरण करो, बैंक कंपनियों का राट्रीयकरण करो। तमाम बड़े-बड़े उद्योग कारखाने जिनमें पूंजीपतियों का लाभ होता है, पूंजीपति बढ़ते हैं, उनका रोजगार लेकर देश की जनता के हाथों में आना चाहिए और वह हुआ, उससे विकास भी हुआ लेकिन जो लागू करने की प्रणाली रही, उसके कारण पब्लिक सैक्टर बहुत बदनाम हुआ और इसीलिए धीरे-धीरे कुप्रबंधन के कारण और राजनीतिक हस्तक्षेप के कारण भी इसमें काफी घाटा होने लगा। तब फिर नैचुरली इस देश की जनता ने उसके खिलाफ मूव बनाई। यह भी एक भावना है कि सरकार इनके घाटे को पूरा करने के लिए कब तक करोड़ों-करोड़ों रुपये देती रहे और अन्य विकास कार्य रोक दिये जायें? इसलिए यह परिस्थिति आज पैदा हुई है। विनिवेश की नीति कांग्रेस के नेताओं ने चलाई, आज ये लोग चला रहे हैं। इसमें जो मुनाफे के पब्लिक सैक्टर हैं, उनका डिसइंवेस्टमेंट हम लोग उचित नहीं समझते हैं। हालांकि हम इस नीति के पक्ष में हैं और जो घाटे के पब्लिक सैक्टर हैं, उनको विनिवेश किया जा सकता है जिससे सरकार पर अतिरिक्त वित्तीय भार न पड़े। इसी के साथ-साथ जो विनिवेश हो रहा है और उससे सबसे बड़ा खतरा यह है कि उसमें जो एससी, एसटी और पिछड़ी जातियों का, कुछ लोगों का जो आरक्षण सरकारी नौकरियों में जो पहले नहीं था, वे भी इसमें शामिल हो गये हैं।

इन तीनों वर्गों का बहुत बड़ा अहित होने जा रहा है । इस संबंध में सरकार की नीति स्पट नहीं है। रिजर्वेशन के बारे में हर पक्ष से प्रश्न लगातार प्रश्न पूछा जा रहा है â€¦(व्यवधान) सरकार प्राइवेट लोगों को देने के बारे में विचार कर रही है, लेकिन हमारी पार्टी की मांग है कि इस संबंध में सरकार की नीति स्पट होनी चाहिए कि प्राइवेट लोगों को देने के बाद रिजर्वेशन रहेगा या नहीं ? सभी माननीय सदस्य पूछते हैं, लेकिन कोई जवाब नहीं दिया जाता है â€¦(व्यवधान) नीति बनाते हैं, लेकिन लागू नहीं करते हैं। इधर-उधर गोल-माल करके रफादफा कर देते हैं । हमारी मांग है कि एससी और एसटी का रिजर्वेशन देने के लिए प्राइवेट कम्पनियों को मजबूर करना चाहिए । इस संबंध में नीति बनायेंगे, तभी संभव होगा। आप आरक्षण के विरोधी है, लेकिन बोलते नहीं है। पूरा सदन चाहता है कि आप स्पट नीति घोषित करें और इसी समय करें ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं ।

श्री रामदास आठवले (पंढरपुर) : महोदय, मैं सरकार की विनिवेश नीति का विरोध करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं । â€¦(व्यवधान)

महोदय, सरकार ने 47 कम्पनियों को प्राइवटाइज करने का निर्णय ले लिया है और प्राइवटाइजेशन में रिजर्वेशन पालिसी का विरोध करते हैं । इसके अलावा प्राइवटाइजेशन 100 परसेंट नहीं होना चाहिए, उसमें सरकार का शेयर 60 प्रतिशत होना चाहिए और प्राइवेट कम्पनियों का शेयर 40 प्रतिशत होना चाहिए। इसके साथ माननीय मंत्री जी कन्ट्रोल सरकार का होना चाहिए। अगर कन्ट्रोल प्राइवेट लोगों का होता रहेगा, तो एक दिन प्राइवेट कम्पनियां सरकार को सत्ता से हटा देंगी । ये लोग बहुत प्लानिंग वाले लोग हैं । यदि आप सत्ता में रहना चाहते हैं, तो आपको इस पर विचार करना चाहिए । सरकार ने बाल्को कम्पनी 551.50 करोड़ रुपए में स्टरलाइट इन्डस्ट्री को बेच दी है । सरकार को चाहिए कि कोई भी कम्पनी 50 परसेंट शेयर से ऊपर प्राइवेट सैक्टर में नहीं बेचे । हम सरकार की प्राइवटाइजेशन नीति का विरोध करते हैं। सरकार ज्यादा कम्पनियों को प्राइवटाइज कर रही है और जितना परसेंट लेना है, उतना लेने की कोशिश कर रही है । इस बारे में मैं आपको चेतावनी देना चाहता हूं । â€¦(व्यवधान) महोदय, हम सब लोग सोनिया गांधी जी, मुलायम सिंह जी, एक साथ मिल कर आयेंगे । आप लोगों ने देश को बेचने का प्रयास किया है ।â€¦(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : आठवले जी, आपकी कोई बात रिकार्ड में नहीं जा रही है।

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have heard with rapt attention the speech of Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi. He is not a Member of the Standing Committee on Finance. I am a Member of the Standing Committee on Finance. He has made his initial remarks as if the Standing Committee on Finance has passed a stricture on this Government that it has got no transparent or comprehensive Policy on Disinvestment.

The hon. Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance is just sitting here. He knows everything, and I am not supposed to tell as to what transpired in the meeting of the Committee on Finance because it is all confidential. He knows it pretty well that no such stricture was passed against this Government. This much I can say.

Secondly, Sir, many Members have raised this point that there is no transparency.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (LATUR): Well, first of all, what transpired in the Committee should not be discussed. Secondly, the Members of this Committee are not expected to speak on it....(*Interruptions*)

Thirdly, does he want to say that what transpired in the Report is not correct? I have not understood as to what he wants to say.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I am opposing to what Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi has said.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : We have said in the Report that there is no comprehensive Disinvestment policy. (*Interruptions*)â€¦Let me put the record correct. We have said that the Government of India does not have a comprehensive Disinvestment Policy. What is going as a policy are the decisions taken by the Government while deciding the cases from time to time. Is that correct or not?

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : No, Sir, this is not correct.â€¦ (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Kharabela Swain, you are a Member of that Committee. You should not try to speak as to what transpired there in the meeting. Otherwise, it will be a very bad precedent.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : You allow me to respond. I am a Member of the Standing Committee on Finance. Now, he says that there is no comprehensive Policy on Disinvestment....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (AHMEDABAD): Sir, has the Report been submitted to the House or not?...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Shri Kharabela Swain is a very good Member of the Committee on Finance. We have always been valuing his views. But first of all, what has transpired in the Committee should not be discussed. Secondly, he is taking a stand which is quite contradictory. When I am sitting here and if I do not say anything at all on it, it will be very wrong...(*Interruptions*)â€¦ Now, the Report is there. One can read it....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARIN PATHAK : We want to know whether the Report has been submitted to the House or not?...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : The hon. Member should avoid that area. He should not speak as to what transpired there....(*Interruptions*)

सभापति महोदय : खारबेल साहब, आप उस पोरशन को, स्थाई संसदीय समिति में चेयरमैन साहब की अध्यक्षता में जो बातें हुई हैं उनकी आप सदन में चर्चा न करें।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री खारबेल स्वाइं : महोदय, प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी जी ने रेफर किया, इसलिए मैं बोल रहा हूं।â€¦(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : पार्लियामेंट के माननीय सदस्य होने के नाते आप अपनी कोई बात कह सकते हैं, लेकिन उसके कहने का एक तरीका होता है।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : स्टैंडिंग कमेटी के सदस्य की हैसियत से इस बात को न कह कर आप अपनी बात कहिए।

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARIN PATHAK : If it has been submitted to the House, anybody can speak on it....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Sir, what I mean to say is this.â€¦ (*Interruptions*)

श्री बिक्रम केशरी देव (कालाहांडी) : अगर रिपोर्ट पार्लियामेंट में सबमिट हो चुकी है तो उसे कोई भी रेफर कर सकता है।...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (GUNA): Sir, whatever Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi has said is a part of the final Report that has been presented. He has not referred to anything which went on within the Committee which is not part of the Report. There is a distinction. There is a distinct difference.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : This is what I am saying; I am not saying anything else. I am only contradicting what he said.

The next point is with regard to transparency. ...(*Interruptions*)

सभापति महोदय : माननीय प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी जी जो बोले हैं केवल उसके प्रतिवाद में आप बोलिये। आप कमेटी में जो कुछ हुआ उसको कोट मत कीजिए।

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I am only contradicting what Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi said.

The second point − many hon. Members have raised this point − is about transparency. They have said that the policy of this Government is not transparent. In the Annual Report of the Department of Disinvestment, a flowchart has been given on the procedure to be followed with regard to disinvestment in public sector undertakings. The Ministry has also got the recommendations of the Disinvestment Commission. Ultimately, the records of the disinvestment process are submitted to the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor-General. If this is not transparency, what else is transparency? The Government is very transparent. It has come out with the Annual Report; it has come out with a flowchart showing the procedure to be followed. The Government has followed this procedure *in toto* in all the disinvestment activities that have already been taken up by this Government.

It is being asked why we should go in for disinvestment of the profit-making public sector undertakings. But what is a profit-making public sector enterprise? Once upon a time, Maruti Udyog Limited was a profit-making public sector undertaking; today, it is not. ...(*Interruptions*) We may always say that the management is not good. The management will never be good because the Government will never become a good entrepreneur. A single telephone call from a Section Officer will unsettle the Managing Director of any public sector company. It will never be possible; Government will never be able to become a good entrepreneur. A question is being raised whether disinvestment is privatisation. If disinvestment is not privatisation, what is it? It is privatisation. Privatisation is the meaning of disinvestment.

We have invested Rs.2,79,000 crore and we are getting a return of a mere 3.8 per cent every year. ...(*Interruptions*)

सभापति महोदय : आप अपने सुझाव दीजिए, मिनिस्टर साहब अपनी रिप्लाई देंगे।

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Shri Ramji Lal Suman was saying that there were no roads and there was no electricity in his village. Where do we get the money from if we invest that money in the public sector only to protect 19 lakh jobs? What about the rest of India? India does not belong to only 19 lakh people; India belongs to more than one billion Indians. So, for meeting the needs of the social sector the money

should be withdrawn from the public sector undertakings. It should be given to the private sector. If the private sector incurs losses, let it go to their accounts. It should not be a burden on the people of this country. So, my appeal to the hon. Minister is that he should go in for privatisation very quickly and divest all the public sector undertakings to the private sector.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I am extremely grateful to the Business Advisory Committee that it selected this small Department to be one of the two Departments whose Demands for Grants should be discussed in the House. I am, in particular, grateful that so many Members − with such powerful and eloquent speaker as Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi − have made such important suggestions throughout this debate. I rise to commend to the House the Demands for Grants of my Ministry.

In the last year and four months, this is the eighth debate in Parliament on disinvestment. In this period, over 415 questions have been answered in the two Houses on disinvestment. I do not think, there is another Department in which there has been such intense interest and for which any Department has responded in such a forthright manner. My colleagues in the Department and I have made a personal effort that whenever a question is asked by any hon. Member, a letter comes to me and we give more than what is customarily given in response to such questions.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Just a minute. I will read just one sentence of the report. It says:

> "The Committee takes a serious note of the fact that no comprehensive policy of Government on disinvestment has been formulated till date."

This is the first sentence of the report.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I will come to that also.

सभापति महोदय : आपको नोट ऑफ डिस्सैंट का अधिकार है। यह कमेटी का एक पार्ट है।

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : The words 'till date' are most important. It means that the Congress Government did not do anything and the UF Government also did not do anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You can give a note of dissent.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: We have made every effort to give more than what is customarily given. Respected Members like Shri Shivraj Patil and others who would have been going through our responses would testify to this point. I will come to the question of policy in just one minute. I may well disagree with his analysis, but I will come to that also.

To meet the interests of the Members and because of the persistent demand from two quarters, I would say this. It may suffice some friends on the other side. Several Chief Ministers have personally requested us to set out the procedures that we are following because that would be of help to them. Many friends, including my old friend Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, have, from the first day, been asking for a White Paper on these matters. I do not want to get into what a White Paper should contain.

There have been, after all, White Papers on Punjab, on Blue Star and there has been a White Paper on Ayodhya. I do not know how many of us remember those things. That is the kind of occasion on which a White Paper is produced. But I took the substance of the requests of both the Chief Ministers and others, for a description of our procedures and the principles that we are following, how advisors have been selected, how bids are being solicited, what kind of advertisements are being placed, when they are to be placed in foreign papers and when they are to be placed in domestic newspapers, etc. They are being considered. We have placed copies of them in the Parliament Library. I send them to the Speaker of Lok Sabha and the Chairman of Rajya Sabha. We are circulating, to every Member and to every State Government, a complete account of every step that is being followed by the Department of Disinvestment and the principles that are being followed in this regard.

Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi referred to this as an anecdote; he said that it was just a chronology of events or of announcements. That is not the case. It is not with the object of saying that you did it and so we are doing it. As many Members have suggested, that is not our intention. Our intention is to say that there has been a continuous evolution of this policy from time to time.

18.00 hrs.

I believe all Governments have built upon the experience, a genuine experience, in transacting such proposals. We learn from the State Governments. For the same reason, for transparency and for learning, we have organised workshops. We just had a workshop for three days in Hyderabad to which Governments of all State Governments had sent their officers so that we could exchange experience and learn. Madhya Pradesh Government had sent six Secretary level officers. People were there from Karnataka. I think that this is one of our tragedies that we do something when we are in Office and when we are in Opposition, all parties oppose the same thing.

Many questions have been raised about valuation. A very senior Member referred to newspaper reports about valuation. When these questions were raised by the hon. Members here and in the other House, like Shri Dipankar Mukherjee, we organised a workshop by SBI Caps which is one of our leading financial institutions and one of our own nationalised banks. I invited several Members who had expressed an interest in this technical subject of valuation. I am sorry to report that while great, eloquent and forceful speeches had been made about Rs. 5,000 crore and so on, not one Member of Parliament took the trouble to come and attend the workshop where all of us sat to learn from experts. But I am not on that point.

We had produced a booklet on the information that the State Governments and the Institute of Public Enterprises has sent us about the disinvestment activities going on in the States. Today, three hon. Members had said that Disinvestment Commission was created but we have choked it. That is not the case. What has happened is that Disinvestment Commission had submitted a large number of reports covering 58 enterprises in which they had recommended disinvestment. Incidentally, it is not a point I want to plead with any force. Almost forty of those enterprises were profit making enterprises. All of them had been referred to the Disinvestment Commission as profit making enterprises for disinvestment purposes. But other than that they had submitted a number of reports and the terms of the members had finished. We felt it to be our duty that we should take substantial steps in implementing the recommendations of the Commission which have already been received. What happens in the case of other Commissions, like Law Commission, they just keep piling up the recommendations. ...(*Interruptions*) Now that we have made very substantial progress in implementing the recommendations of the Disinvestment Commission, I can report to you, Sir, that I personally discussed the matter with the Finance Minister who is sitting here, with the Prime Minister and with others. We are trying to finalise the list of completely independent persons who would be members of the Disinvestment Commission. I do hope that you will be satisfied with this fact that we would only look for the greatest expertise on the market, on the enterprise and on management. Only those kinds of persons would be inducted into the Commission. ...(*Interruptions*)

I want to answer each of the specific and very important questions which have been raised but I do want to suggest to keep in mind two facts and in that context please consider the situation of the economy and the situation of the public sector in the economy. Nobody is out to minimise the role of the public sector. It has a very important role but the role changes with time. In Panditji's time there was one role जैसे अभी कहा जा रहा था, a base had to be set up at that time for the industrial progress of the country. A springboard had to be set up. If that spring-board later on became a mile stone and other demands are demanding attention; like investment in the social sector or in areas that were just behind, then it was necessary to change the role of Government at that time.

I would just like to mention two figures. The Members may assess the continuing losses in public sector enterprises and these marginal profits of minus four per cent, excluding the petroleum sector in which there was the monopoly, the rate of return is minus four per cent at a time when the Government is borrowing money at 11 to 12 per cent. I will just recall to you one figure which the Finance Minister drew attention to in his Budget speech. If we take merely the interest paid on past debts, not the repayment of principal amount, it is up to 70 per cent of the total tax revenue of the Government of India. If you take interest and repayment of past debt, it exceeds the total tax revenue of the Government of India. This is the kind of situation.

Just now some figures were quoted by Shri Kirit Somaya. He was quoting some figures for West Bengal and other States. I will give you one figure which I hope every one of our distinguished colleagues will commit to his memory. Since I have been in the Planning Commission, I have to deal with it every day. The total outlay of the State Governments during the Ninth Plan was supposed to be Rs.3,50,000 crore. They were to contribute only Rs.3,800 crore, just one per cent, from their own resources. Four years of the Plan have gone by. Their contribution, instead of Rs.3,800 crore in the first four years, has been minus Rs.114,000 crore. It is a very serious economic situation. All the reforms which had been pioneered by distinguished persons from all sides of this House, and certainly from the other side,

should be considered in the perspective of this urgency that is required.

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : सभापति महोदय, सरकार विनिवेश की नीति में पारदर्शिता की नीति को अपनाने को तैयार नहीं है। हमारे पूर्वजों के द्वारा तैयार किये गये करोड़ों-अरबों रुपये के सार्वजनिक उपक्रमों को कौड़ियों के मोल बेचकर देश को खोखला कर रही है। इसलिए इस नीति के विरोध में हम और हमारी समाजवादी पार्टी सदन से बहिर्गमन कर रही है।

1809 hrs.

(तत्पश्चात् कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह तथा कुछ अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने सदन से बहिर्गमन किया।)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: The first point that has been made from Shri P.R. Dasmunsi to several other Members − our distinguished Member, Shri Shivraj Patil read out that sentence from the Standing Committee's Report- I respectfully disagree with that, the question of what do you define a policy to mean. The policy has been stated in successive Budget statements on this very floor by the Finance Minister. He has spelt out the category of enterprises which would be disinvested, the quantum which would be disinvested. He has spelt out what precautions would be taken.

He has spelt out what proportion of equity would be held. He has spelt out what pre-conditions would be ensured before disinvestment is taking place. For instance, to ensure that the withdrawal of the public sector does not result in private monopolies, he has spelt out that in those sectors where regulatory authorities are necessary before the withdrawal of the public sector, those regulatory authorities will be put in place. He has spelt out over time, the purpose for which the proceeds will be used. All these things have been repeatedly stated. I just do not see what is the occasion for that kind of a comprehensive remark.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Sir, I want to say somethingâ€¦ (*Interruptions*) After you finish, let me also put one or two questions, which you can explain properly.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I have elaborated on our policy on successive occasions and this is probably the fourth or fifth occasion in this House itself. We have spelt out the processes which are needed to be followed in answers to parliamentary questions. The flow chart which is being referred to, is being stated in response to parliamentary questions. We have said what would be done if a transaction is completed.

I will now come to parliamentary supervision. It is precisely to assist Parliament that we have taken a step which, as I mentioned last time, not a single State Government or any previous Government has taken, namely, the moment a transaction is completed, all papers will be sent to -- and have been sent to − the Comptroller and Auditor General so that he sends a report to Parliament and to the people directly. I am happy to report that he has departed from his normal procedure so that this can be done swiftly.

In the case of Modern Foods, loose references continue to be made all the time. The Comptroller and Auditor General has already completed his preliminary report. We have already sent him the further assistance or comments which were required. Similarly, probably within less than a week of the transaction on BALCO being completed, all the papers relating to that were sent to the Comptroller and Auditor General and his officers are already inspecting each one of them. As swiftly as possible for them, they will submit that report directly to you.

Sir, every decision is being taken by the Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment. It is not the prerogative of any individual. It is headed by the Prime Minister and senior Ministers are its Members including particularly the Ministers in whom many persons in the Opposition have, from time to time, reposed hope that they will stop disinvestment process. कभी शरद यादव जी का नाम लेते हैं, कभी मनोहर जोशी का नाम लेते हैं, कभी राम नाईक का नाम लेते हैं, सब उसके मेम्बर हैं।

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी (रायगंज) : आज से बंद कर देंगे, और नाम नहीं लेंगे।

श्री अरुण शौरी : प्रियरंजन दास जी भी अब सीख रहे हैं।

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी : नाम लेकर हम आपकी मदद करना चाहते हैं। अगर आप कहते हैं तो नहीं करेंगे।

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: At every meeting of the Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment, the administrative Ministry which controls that particular enterprise and supervises it, is represented. The whole case is processed over several months by Inter-Ministerial Groups in which seven or eight Ministries like Law, Company Affairs, Industries, etc. are all represented. Every single decision is being announced immediately upon its being taken.

The point that has always been made is that there is no comprehensive policy or a uniform policy. Sir, it is a serious point. As Dr. Ramaiah with his vast experience and wisdom was telling, please bear with me

that decisions have to vary from enterprise to enterprise. I will give you the reason for that. As regards VSNL, it is completely a different enterprise. Its primary function, unlike MTNL whose primary function has been to provide a service, was that it was given a monopoly for a gateway. Now, the Government has announced that the monopoly will be taken away by 1st April, 2002 which is a few months' away.

So, a decision for that had to be of a completely different kind. अभी हमारे मैम्बर कह रहे थे कि आप उनको स्ट्रैंथन क्यों नहीं कर रहे हैं before you can go in for disinvestment. That only shows that we have not studied the type of decisions which have been taken. In the case of VSNL आप कहते थे कि लालफीताशाही को बन्द करो। The decision that was taken by the Cabinet was that before your monopoly ends, please use your cash reserves to go into new businesses and you need not come back to the Government or to the Cabinet for saying which businesses you are going into. I would like to know which other Government has given this kind of autonomy to its public sector enterprise.

Secondly, the Government said please strengthen the Board of Directors so that it becomes so strong that it acts as a fire-wall between the enterprise and the Government. Mr. Narayana Murthy of Infosys is a member, Shri Bhargav of Eicher is also a member of the Board. These distinguished persons have been brought in so that the enterprises becomes dynamic. Before it finds a strategic partner it has been allowed to go into new business. The Minister of Telecom is here. At his urging it has been decided that they must be allowed to go in for joint ventures even before any disinvestment type of thing takes place.

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : सभापति महोदय, हमारा पाइंट आफ आर्डर है।

सभापति महोदय : ठीक है, किस नियम के तहत है ?

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : नियम 208 के अन्तर्गत। कार्यसूची के आइटम संख्या 17 में गिलोटीन का समय सायंकाल 6.00 बजे का दिया गया है। जो टाइम दिया गया है, उसी पर गिलोटीन लगना चाहिए और वोटिंग होनी चाहिए। चूंकि आपने हाउस की अनुमति नहीं ली है। इसलिए कृपया हाउस की अनुमति लेने की कृपा करें। मेरा यही पाइंट आफ आर्डर है।

सभापति महोदय : रघुवंश प्रसाद जी, ऐसा है, माननीय मंत्री जी का जवाब चल रहा है। जैसे ही जवाब समाप्त होगा, सदन की अनुमति ली जाएगी और गिलोटीन लगाया जाएगा।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : महोदय, नियम में दिया गया है और समय अध्यक्ष महोदय ने सायंकाल 6.00 बजे का निर्धारित किया है। इसे अनिवार्यत: फौलो किया जाना चाहिए।

सभापति महोदय : ठीक है, नियमों से सभी बंधे हुए हैं, हम भी बंधे हुए हैं और आप भी।

क्या सदन की सहमति है कि मंत्री महोदय के जवाब होने तक गिलोटीन का टाइम बढ़ा दिया जाए?

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : हां, समय बढ़ा दिया जाए।

सभापति महोदय : सदन की अनुमति से गिलोटीन का समय मंत्री महोदय के जवाब समाप्त होने तक बढ़ाया जाता है।

रघुवंश बाबू, आपने होल हाउस की सैंस देख ली है। होल हाउस की सैंस ले ली है। अब आप कृपया बैठ जाइए। ऐसा कोई हार्ड एंड फास्ट रूल नहीं है। जब तक मंत्री का जवाब चल रहा है तब तक गिलोटीन का समय बढ़ा दिया जाता है, वह अन्तर्निहित है।

श्री रामदास आठवले : सदन का समय बढ़ाइए।

सभापति महोदय : आठवले जी, आप बैठिए। यह बात आपकी समझ के बाहर की है।

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Similarly, just as the decision has to vary from case to case, even in one sector like Telecom itself, it has to vary from one case to another. For instance, MTNL has to be different from VSNL and also from GSNL in all these policies. Similarly, there are other enterprises in Government. It would be surprising to know that Maruti Udyog Limited is not a Government enterprise because the Government"s share has already been reduced - not now, but in 1992 - to 49.74 per cent. So, it is not a Government enterprise. Therefore, decisions that you will follow in the case of Maruti Udyog Limited will have to be completely different and the course which you will follow will also be different. You do not have to negotiate with anybody when you are a hundred per cent owner.

But in the case of Maruti, you are obliged by the 1992 Agreement and you cannot do anything except to oblige by the Agreement, the written consent of Suzuki. So, how can you have an iron-clad rule and procedure and decision for different enterprises? It is a clear policy, Sir. It is implemented in reference to each Committee , by the widest possible consultation, and all decisions are being taken by a Committee presided over by the Prime Minister. Also, overtime, that policy will change. I will give you one instance.

Shri Dasmunsi was making a great point about the difference between disinvestment and privatisation. There is nothing to hide in this. A very good exposition was given and I will send the speech of the Chief

Minister, Andhra Pradesh to all the Members in which he has spelt out this difference. The word "disinvestment" came to be used because in the initial stages, when this policy was inaugurated, all that was being done was of minority sale of 5 per cent or 10 per cent and so on. That did not changeâ€¦â€¦ (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : I am sick of such a replyâ€¦â€¦ (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : We are sick of such interruptionsâ€¦â€¦ (*Interruptions*)

सभापति महोदय : माननीय मंत्री जी के अलावा किसी और की कोई भी बात रिकार्ड में नहीं जायेगी।

...(व्यवधान)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: That is why, this word "disinvestment" was chosen. Now, the Deve Gowda Government realised and the Disinvestment Commission itself pointed out that this will not do. It does not change the character, the work culture, the management culture of an enterprise if you just widely disperse 5 or 10 per cent of its shares. Therefore, they said, Look for strategic partners. And for this very purpose, that word came. The content of the policy was changed quite correctly. The country and the Government are learning from their experience. So, Sir, the question really is that the policy should be open and it should be discussed from time to time as this policy is. Individual transactions should be completely transparent and mentioned.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : You just said that the hon. Finance Minister in his policy statement had abundantly made it clear that disinvestment does not necessarily mean private monopolisation. You said so quoting him. And you, in your document and even in narration also, are now justifying that the text is now being changed. Strategic partner means the ownership of the strategic partnership. It is established in the case of BALCO and it will be again established in the petroleum sector tomorrow. So, there is a contradiction between what you say and the policy statement that you quoted from the Finance Minister.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: The Finance Minister told me to inform you that you do not know the meaning of the word "monopoly". But other than that, it is a private conversation. I do not want to speak on thatâ€¦â€¦ (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAVIN RASHTRAPAL : Please look at the figures in the Union Budget for the last three years. I have raised about it last time also but he has not replied to it. Now it has come out in the Press that all the figures of last year's Budget are incorrect and that is why, this year, he has not given the actual and revised figures of the last two years. You cannot refer to the Budget here. So, do not depend upon him. It is all cooked-up figures so far as the Union Budget is concerned. .....(*Interruptions*)

सभापति महोदय: माननीय मंत्री जी, हमने किसी भी माननीय सदस्य को बोलने की परमीशन नहीं दी है इसलिए आप बोलिये। मंत्री जी के अलावा किसी और की कोई बात रिकार्ड में नहीं जायेगी।

...(व्यवधान) *

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please take your seat. This is not fair. What is happening here?

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: This is how the learning process has gone on. After the disinvestment of minority sales, in the Fifth Report, reviewing that experience, the Disinvestment Commission said like this: "Do not just only go for the sale. Do not just go looking for a strategic partner. It said and I quote:

> "In order to assure the strategic buyer that eventually Government would withdraw from the PSU, it is necessary that the agreement with the strategic buyer should spell out the details, including the time-frame, for further dilution of Government share holding. However, even at the time of the initial induction of the strategic buyer, Government should entrust management control to him as already recommended. The agreement should also spell out clearly the medium-term and long-term strategy for the enterprise. Continued Government presence in the PSU with significant share holding exceeding the holding of the strategic buyer even as a transitional arrangement would deter prospective bidders. "

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : It is "exceeding the holding of the strategic buyer." Please note that.

* Not Recorded.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Yes, it is exceeding the holding of the strategic buyer. If you exceed, then they will not come forward. Please understand it. I further quote:

> **"The Commission, therefore, recommends that Government may keep its direct share holding below the level of the investment being offered to the strategic bidder by divesting some of the portions of its equity to institutions etc. "**

All of this is not to cast blame. Everybody was learning from this process. In this question of transparency, Sir, as I mentioned to you, every decision being taken was publicised at every stage − from the selection of advisors to inviting of expression of interest, to inviting the technical bids, to inviting financial bids, to the opening of bids, to the announcing of results. It was being done in full. Every result is being announced to the public. I just do not think what this question of transparency is. I will mention to you what I understand some persons' conception of transparency is. They ask: "Why are you not giving us the names of the bidders? Why are you not giving us the reserve price? Why are you not giving us the number of the bidders?" I really do not want to say this. But I know how much interest different competitors have in finding out these details. You disclose the reserve price which has been determined by an Inter-Ministerial Group, which is confidential. Immediately the purchaser will give only two rupees more and say: "I win the bid." My friends, do you want that the Government's ability to get the maximum amount from the bidders should be jeopardised in this way? Similarly, in the case of the number of bidders, the best way is that the bidders should not know how many they are competing against. If they know there is only one bidder that they have to compete against, they can form a cartel within. It is for these reasons that we do not confirm the names. The corporate rivals give the names. It is my entreaty to every hon. Member of this House, specially Members who rely on the newspapers, to believe me. Since I have been there for a few months, in this matter, I see that every fourth or fifth day, there is a plant from some corporate rival about some transaction that is going on.

18.29 hrs. (Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Many of our hon. Members, many of our colleagues, get misled by those things. But we must beware of these kinds of plants. These phrases are used, for instance, in the case of the IPCL. Such a learned Member was just saying like this: "You have, in effect, nationalised the losses of the Baroda Plant and privatised the profits of the two other units."

The fact of the matter is the opposite. The IPCL has three units. Regarding these three units, the Government have earlier taken a decision that all three units will be offered for auction at one time, and it so happened that in the end, only one serious bidder was left. I will tell you why? I was told that it was at the initiative of the Chairman of the IOC that I went back to the Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment and requested the same to modify their earlier decision. I will tell you how? He told me, Sir, the Baroda plant is on the land of IOC. The IOC was set up so as to use the project of the IOC Refinery in Baroda. If you give to my rival − I do not mind disclosing it to you - it was Reliance. When I went to this department, I was told that Reliance is going to just eat up these three plants. They are waiting for it.

An hon. Member has written letters to me. There has been an operation on IPCL's share being sold and the prices have artificially brought down so that somebody can grab it at a low price. The Chairman of the IOC, Shri Pathan, disclosed all this to me, and said that this is the situation of the plant, and this is why it was set up long ago. Where will I use my naptha from that refinery if this plant goes to my rival? So, the Cabinet saw the reason for that and it said, yes, Baroda plant will go to IOC, and the other two plants will go for auctioning. There have been newspaper stories as to why the other two plants are being given for international competitive bidding. This amounts to selling the country to foreigners. If we do not do that, what is the result?

We have in India one or two cash rich companies. That would mean that if we do not have good competition, these one or two cash rich companies will get this at whatever price they want. Then, they will accuse the Government that everything is being tailored to give these to one or two companies.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, how much more time are you going to take?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I will conclude this point.

SHRI PRAVIN RASHTRAPAL : He also does not want us to read newspapers. ...(*Interruptions*) He wants us to read *Ramayan* and *Geetha*. ...(*Interruptions*) हम सामना भी पढ़ते हैं, पांचजन्य भी पढ़ते हैं। ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: This kind of interruption is not good.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAVIN RASHTRAPAL : He is criticising reading newspapers. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Is he justifying that while he was a journalist all those stories published were wrong?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: The point was made again by three Members, why do we not come to Parliament to seek approval of each of these transactions and explain to Committees of Parliament as the transactions are going on? Shri Munsi mentioned it and other Members also mentioned it. I will give to the House just a bit of history and tell the House as to why this is not done. Please listen to this. I am not saying that the Congress did this, therefore, we are doing it. It is not that. There is a reason in law. There is a reason in law as to why we do not come to Parliament for all these things. I will give the law itself just now.

You just see from 1992-97. It is not the Congress Government, you will see the law behind it − Rs.18,000 crore of Government shares were sold. Did anybody come to Parliament to get sanction for those sellings? No. Similarly, I will give you the instance of Maruti. Maruti was incorporated in 1981. Hundred per cent shares were with the Government. Twenty six per cent were sold in 1982 to Suzuki. Did anybody came to Parliament? This was, then, raised to 40 per cent. Did anybody come to Parliament? In 1992, 50 per cent was given to Suzuki.

The Government holding was reduced to 49.74 per cent and it was made a non-Government company. Did anybody come to Parliament at that time? No. I will explain why that was right. Similarly, in 1995, when we had a very eminent lawyer as the Minister in-charge, Shri N.K.P. Salve, the Vikers Babcock Limited, which was a boiler and cement making unit in West Bengal and Karnataka, was sold to ABB. Did anybody come to Parliament then? No. Why did they not come to Parliament? It is because the legal position is clear in this matter.

There are two conditions under which you have to come to Parliament. One is, if the enterprise has been constituted under an Act of Parliament, you have to come back to Parliament. Secondly, if the Act provides for a change in the shareholding pattern, then you have to come back to Parliament.

Sir, in the specific case of Air India, a question was raised. The Air India Act of 1953 has been repealed and these units had been made corporations. Once they are made corporations under the law, they are governed by the Companies Act passed by this Parliament. Then, the transfer of shares and sale of shares depend upon Companies Act and not upon coming back to Parliament.

There is a very good case with regard to IISCO. IISCO was nationalised under an Act of Parliament, but when the plans for disinvestment of IISCO were drawn up, they were drawn up in a different way, because that Act had been repealed and IISCO had been made a subsidiary of SAIL. It is now governed under the Companies Act. So, there is no separate law at all for Government companies in regard to transfer of shares. For that reason, you do not have to come back to Parliament for each transaction.

Sir, I will now come to two or three specific points on labour.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : I raised a question about Sterlite. Kindly explain about that.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: That is a very important question. I will certainly come to it. Please bear with me, because the Speaker is asking me to hurry up. If I do not give you a reply, you say: "I have not replied". If I reply, you are saying that I am taking too long.

Shri Prakash Paranjpe said कि मैं चार महीने से कह रहा हूं एच.ओ.सी.एल. के बारे में और क्यों नहीं विनिवेश विभाग कहता कि पेट्रोलियम डिपार्टमेंट उसको हैंडल करेगा। अभी कह देते हैं। पैट्रोलियम मिनिस्टर साहब ने मीटिंग बुलाई, आपकी चिट्ठियों के बाद बुलाई, जोशी जी खुद आए थे. अगर आप सारी चीजें जांचना चाहते हैं, कहते हैं कि बी.पी.सी.एल. लेना चाहती है तो क्यों नहीं दे रहे। **I will tell you what the BPCL authorities said in that meeting. He will scold me for it, but I will disclose that. They said: "we do not want it".** पता नहीं कैसी मनगढ़ंत चीजें आ जाती हैं। जब मैं कहता हूं, क्षमा करें, आप कहेंगे कि आफिशियल मीटिंग की प्रोसीडिंग डिसक्लोज की जा रही हैं।

I will give you my forecast today. If you continue to delay things like disinvestment in HOCL, by March next year, HOCL will be a BIFR case. I will tell you how.

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): It is a wrong information you are having. It is because of

mismanagement, the company is incurring losses and you are not taking action against the bureaucrats. Upto 1998, the company was giving dividend and because of the wrong decision of the management, the company has gone into losses. But you are making the workers suffer for that.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: No; I am going to come to the point about the interest of the workers. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: No, no; please sit down.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing should go on record except the Minister's reply.

***(Interruptions)* ***

*** Not Recorded**

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I will take up only three other points and then finish. I come directly to the point that Shri Paranjape has raised that we are penalising the workers.

Similarly, the point was made in regard to BALCO that the interests of the workers have been jeopardised. Is it not a surprise to all of you that the factory has been stopped for so long - since the beginning of March. Till this date, the workers have not at all raised any demand about their service conditions. It is not there till today. Why is it so? It is a very important thing to ponder over....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : He should reply to Shri Paranjape.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: It is very interesting that they are raising these demands. Shri Patwa is sitting here. There was a letter from Shri Yogi and also a telephone call at 1130 at night. Shri Jogi requested him, "Please do something and find a way out." The leaders of all the seven unions signed a letter and sent it to Shri Patwa. It said, "Please do this." He said, "All right, come." It is very interesting. Shri Patwa asked them, "Do you have no demands about your own working conditions, your security, your wages and your tenure? Nothing!" They gave a speech on disinvestment.

There is a very interesting point. In 1999, these very unions had challenged the disinvestment of BALCO in the Delhi High Court. You see, all their prayers were against the disinvestment proposal. The Court asked them. Please see the Court's order. I can read it out to you. The Court's order says, "They did not press this demand at all." There was no other demand. The only demand was about the disinvestment proposal. When they came to Shri Patwa, again, they had no single demand about the workers' tenure.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, last time, we had a very good discussion on BALCO. You also gave a very good reply at that time. You can leave this part.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I will conclude, Sir. ...(*Interruptions*) Allegations were made about Modern Foods and others. If you do not want me to go through them, I will just skip it and come only to the point on which Shri Dasmunsi is very exercised, that is, the order of SEBI in regard to Sterlite, Videocon, BPL and one of the advisers to four firms. It is a very important order in the views of the Government. For that very reason, the moment we read about the order being given by SEBI, immediately, I personally sat with my staff. We drafted all the legal questions that arose from that order and we sent it to the Minister of Law and to the Department for their particular advice.

I will tell you that they have had meetings earlier this afternoon on that very thing. While I have to receive the opinion of the Minister of Law in writing, I have been informed that these were the three points that came up: First, that the order does not have retrospective effect.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : There was an opinion by the Legal Department. The Solicitor General's office said that SEBI was under clout. At that time, you disposed it. Now, Sterlite is called by SEBI and you are saying that the order does not have retrospective effect. ...(*Interruptions*) This is not fair. This is not transparent.

MR. SPEAKER: Let him complete his reply first.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: You are mixing up the two things. Solicitor General's opinion, to which you referred in the previous debate, did not have anything to do with the current transactions that are now the subject of SEBI's findings. That was about a contract in the Telecom Department. A tender had been floated. If you want details, please give me only two minutes. I will give it to you.

I have checked personally with the Solicitor-General on that. I do not want to be wrong in these matters.

In this matter, a tender had been floated. Several persons bid. Sterlite also bid. Sterlite bid at a very low price. Half-an-hour before that tender closed, Sterlite said, "No, that is a wrong price that our people quoted, it should be at this price." Probably they got to know the prices quoted by others. Precisely what he wants is this so called crest for transparency!

Then, the Department of Telecom, to its great credit, said, "No, we will hold you to the low price." Then, they raised the dispute. The Department of Telecom snatched away the order which had been assigned to them and distributed it among other bidders. Sterlite again raised a dispute. The Department of Telecom went to the Solicitor-General and the Solicitor-General said, "Yes, you are right, Sterlite is wrong, you must hold it that low price."

I had said in the Rajya Sabha that if that kind of an occasion were to arise, that Sterlite were to now say, "Oh, my bid was Rs.551 crore, the other fellow"s bid was for Rs.275 crore, I did the typing mistake, it should have been Rs.351 crore not Rs.551 crore", I rely on the same opinion of the Solicitor-General and hold them to the high price.

Now, in the case of SEBI"s findings, it is a different matter. We have taken very serious note of it. For that reason, the opinion is in three points. I will give it to the House, if I am given just one minute. One is that in transactions which are concluded...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Sir, I will ask the hon. Minister to defend the Government and not the Sterlite. Why is he defending Sterlite? He should punish Sterlite.

MR. SPEAKER: Let him complete, please.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, it is very difficult, if Shri Dasmunsi asks a question and if I do not give a reply, he says that I am not answering. If I give a reply, he says that I am defending them. I am only concerned with the Government"s decision.

In the Government"s decision, the orders do not have retrospective effect. The second point is that the Chairman, SEBI has said, "They cannot have access to the capital market for two years, three years and four yearsâ€¦ (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : In that case what is the future of BALCO? What for they are there if they are not allowed into capital market. The hon. Minister should tell me...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, you need not reply to Shri Dasmunsi"s point because he has already participated in the debate. You can address whatever points you have left.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, it is so interesting that our friends do not even read what the Chairman of SEBI himself has said on this very matter. He has said that his restriction applies to those firms only and not to the firms in which they are partners or not to their subsidiaries. BALCO can go to the capital market. Sterlite may or may not be allowed to go. Sir, none of these things is studied and just a great speech is made. Therefore, I commend to you the Demands for Grants of my Departmentâ€¦ (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAMDAS ATHAWALE : Sir, he has not answered the question regarding reservation...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing should go on record except the hon. Minister"s reply.

***(Interruptions)* ***

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, we have a clear policy and it is a transparent policy. Please endorse these

Demands.

Thank you.

SHRI RAMDAS ATHAWALE : Sir, we want reservations for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the private sector also...(*Interruptions*)

*** Not Recorded**

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. I have called Shri Shivraj Patil.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: No, please. Nothing should go on record, except Shri Patil"s submission.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Sir, I am not asking a question on tenders or on units or on individuals or on specific cases. I am trying to understand from the Government a very important matter relating to the policy. We have said that the Government does not have a comprehensive disinvestment policy and the hon. Minister has not, in his reply, today also said that the Government has a comprehensive policy. He has said that the matters were presented to the House through the replies to the questions and the matters were presented to the House when the Budget was presented. Is this the way in which a comprehensive policy is made through the replies to the questions and through one or two sentences or four or five sentences in the Budget? Can we call this as a comprehensive policy?

The public sector undertakings were built with the toil, blood and money of the people of this country. The Congress Party was responsible for building them. Now, we are disinvesting them. We have said that we are not objecting to disinvestment *per se*. What we are saying is this. Does the Government have any clear-cut policy on the public sector undertakings which have been nationalised from the private sector, public sector undertakings which are making the profits, public sector undertakings which are not making the profits, public sector undertakings which are in the strategic area, and public sector undertakings which were not created for earning profit but providing facilities to the people and for helping the people in the development of this country? What is the policy?

One of the most important points which has been raised by many Members in this House is how we are going to protect the interests of the workers in the public sector units, which will be transferred to the private sector. We would like to know whether the interests of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe people are protected or not. Unless the Government has got a clear-cut policy, the action of the Government cannot be transparent. ...(*Interruptions*) Not in this way ...(*Interruptions*) Sir, what we are asking from this Government is this. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: He asks, whether the Government has any clear-cut policy or not.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Sir, within a minute, I will complete.

The Government has to be transparent and the Government can be transparent only by having a clear-cut lucid policy known to the people, known to those people who are going to bid and things like that. We are not asking for the tenders to be presented on the floor of the House. We expect the Government to reply to this. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, would you like to reply?

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I would have taken up each one of these points. Today I would have elaborated the point on labour but for the shortage of time and the feeling on all sides that I should stop.

Just by using the words that it is not comprehensive and so on, these are just words. It is a detailed policy.

You have mentioned three criteria, whether there is differentiation between those units which were set up *ab initio* by the Government and those which were nationalised. In our view, there is no difference in that. They are public sector units today. We are taking a uniform view in assessing whether we should disinvest and privatise them or not. Secondly, you said whether the criterion is profit making and loss

making or not. As I have explained, Sir, ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : You are not replying whether you have a comprehensive policy or not. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: My answer is, it is yes, we have a policy. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You have a comprehensive policy?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Yes, Sir.

...(*Interruptions*)

1855 hours

(At this stage,Prof. A.K. Premajam and some other

hon. Members left the House.)

(At this stage, Shri Bir Singh Mahato left the House.)

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the Demands for Grants relating to the Department of Disinvestment to vote.

The question is:

> **"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper, be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to *complete* the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in the course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 2002, in respect of heads of Demands entered in the Second column thereof against Demand No. 20 relating to the Department of Disinvestment."**

The motion was adopted.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRAVIN RASHTRAPAL : Sir, I walk out because the Government's reply on disinvestment is not satisfactory.

18.56 hrs.

(At this stage, Shri Pravin Rashtrapal left the House.)

...(Interruptions)

1857 hrs.

(तत्पश्चात् श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह, श्री हरीभाऊ शंकर महाले, श्री रामदास आठवले, तथा कुछ अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने सदन से बहिर्गमन किया।)

18.57 hrs.

SUBMISSION OF OUTSTANDING DEMANDS TO VOTE OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the Outstanding Demands for Grants relating to the Ministries/Departments to vote.

The question is:

> **"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper, be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in the course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 2002, in respect of heads of Demands entered in the Second column thereof, against:-**

1. **Demand Nos.1 to 4 relating to Ministry of Agriculture;**
2. **Demand Nos.5 and 6 relating to Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers;**
3. **Demand No.7 relating to Ministry of Civil Aviation;**
4. **Demand No.8 relating to Ministry of Coal;**
5. **Demand Nos.9 and 10 relating to Ministry of Commerce and Industry;**
6. **Demand Nos.11 and 12 relating to Ministry of Communications;**
7. **Demand Nos.13 to 19 relating to Ministry of Defence;**
8. **Demand No.21 relating to Ministry of Environment and Forests;**
9. **Demand No.22 relating to Ministry of External Affairs;**
10. **Demand Nos.23 to 25, 27, 28, 30 to 35 relating to Ministry of Finance;**
11. **Demand Nos.36 and 37 relating to Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution;**
12. **Demand Nos.38 to 40 relating to Ministry of Health and Family Welfare;**
13. **Demand Nos.41 to 45 and 96 to 100 relating to Ministry of Home Affairs;**
14. **Demand Nos.46 to 48 relating to Ministry of Human Resource Development;**
15. **Demand Nos.49 and 50 relating to Ministry of Heavy Industries and Public Enterprises;**
16. **Demand No.51 relating to Ministry of Information and Broadcasting;**
17. **Demand No.52 relating to Ministry of Information Technology;**
18. **Demand No.53 relating to Ministry of Labour;**
19. **Demand Nos.54, 55 and 57 relating to Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs;**
20. **Demand No.58 relating to Ministry of Mines;**
21. **Demand No.59 relating to Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources;**
22. **Demand No.60 relating to Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs;**
23. **Demand No.61 relating to Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions;**
24. **Demand No.62 relating to Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas;**
25. **Demand No.63 relating to Ministry of Planning;**
26. **Demand No.64 relating to Ministry of Power;**
27. **Demand Nos.68 to 70 relating to Ministry of Science and Technology;**
28. **Demand No.71 relating to Ministry of Small Scale Industries and Agro and Rural Industries;**
29. **Demand No. 72 relating to Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation;**
30. **Demand No.73 relating to Ministry of Steel;**
31. **Demand No.74 relating to Ministry of Road Transport and Highways;**
32. **Demand No.75 relating to Ministry of Shipping;**
33. **Demand No.76 relating to Ministry of Textiles;**
34. **Demand Nos.77 and 78 relating to Ministry of Tourism and Culture;**
35. **Demand No.79 relating to Ministry of Tribal Affairs;**
36. **Demand Nos.80 to 83 relating to Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation;**
37. **Demand No.84 relating to Ministry of Water Resources;**
38. **Demand No.85 relating to Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment;**
39. **Demand No.86 relating to Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports;**
40. **Demand Nos.87 and 88 relating to Department of Atomic Energy;**
41. **Demand No.89 relating to Department of Ocean Development;**

<u>19.00 hrs.</u>

1. **Demand No. 90 relating to Department of Space;**
2. **Demand No. 92 relating to Rajya Sabha;**
3. **Demand No. 93 relating to Lok Sabha;**
4. **Demand No. 95 relating to Secretariat of the Vice-President;**

The motion was adopted.